arXiv:1112.5817v1 [math.AP] 26 Dec 2011

WELL-POSEDNESS FOR THE CLASSICAL STEFAN PROBLEM AND THE ZERO SURFACE TENSION LIMIT

MAHIR HADŽIĆ AND STEVE SHKOLLER

Abstract. We develop a framework for a *unified* treatment of well-posedness for the Stefan problem with and without surface tension. In the absence of surface tension, we provide new estimates for the regularity of the moving free-surface. We construct solutions as a limit of a carefully chosen sequence of approximate solutions to our so-called κ-problem, in which moving surface is regularized and the boundary condition is modified. We conclude by proving that solutions of the Stefan problem with positive surface tension σ converge to solutions of the classical Stefan problem as $\sigma\to 0$.

1. Introduction

1.1. **The problem formulation.** We consider the local well-posedness and boundary regularity of solutions to the classical one-phase Stefan problem, describing the evolving phase boundary of a freezing liquid. The temperature of the liquid $p(t,x)$ and the *a priori unknown* moving boundary $\Gamma(t)$ must satisfy the following system of equations:

$$p_t-\Delta p=0 \quad \text{in } \Omega(t); \tag{1.1a}$$

$$\partial_n p=V_{\Gamma(t)} \quad \text{on } \Gamma(t); \tag{1.1b}$$

$$p=\sigma\kappa_\Gamma \quad \text{on } \Gamma(t); \tag{1.1c}$$

$$p(0,\cdot)=p_0,\ \Gamma(0)=\Gamma_0. \tag{1.1d}$$

Here, $\Omega(t)$ is an evolving open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d\geq 2$, with $\Gamma(t)$ denoting the moving boundary (which may be a connected subset of $\partial\Omega(t)$ if a part of the boundary is fixed).

Equation (1.1a) expresses the fact that heat heat diffuses in the bulk $\Omega(t)$, while the boundary condition (1.1b) states that the heat flux across the boundary governs the boundary evolution; that is, $\partial_n p=\nabla p\cdot n$ is the normal derivative of p on $\Gamma(t)$ where n stands for the outward pointing unit normal, and $V_{\Gamma(t)}$ denotes the speed or the normal velocity of the hypersurface $\Gamma(t)$. In the case that $\sigma=0$, (1.1c) is termed the *classical Stefan condition* and problem (1.1) is called the *classical Stefan problem*. In this case, freezing of the liquid occurs at a constant temperature $p=0$. On the other hand, if $\sigma>0$ in (1.1c) then the boundary condition is called the *Gibbs-Thomson correction* to the classical Stefan condition, and the system (1.1) is then termed the *Stefan problem with surface tension*, whereby $\sigma>0$ is a given coefficient of surface tension and $\kappa_{\Gamma(t)}$ stands for the mean curvature of the moving boundary $\Gamma(t)$. Finally, we equip the problem with suitable initial conditions (1.1d): $p_0:\Omega(0)\to\mathbb{R}$ and Γ_0 are the prescribed initial temperature and boundary, respectively.

Problem (1.1) falls into the category of free boundary problems that require further assumptions on the initial data in order to be well-posed. In our context, such a stability condition is called the *Taylor sign condition* and it reads:

$$\partial_n p_0>0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma(0).$$

We will come back to this later in the introduction and explain how it naturally emerges from our analysis.

1.2. **The reference domain Ω and the dimension.** We will begin the analysis with motion in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and then describe the minor modifications which arise for motion in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Also, in order to simplify our presentation, we will choose our initial domain to be

$$\Omega=\mathbb{T}^1\times]0,1[,$$

where $\mathbb{T}^1$ stands for the 1-torus. This allows us to use *one* global Cartesian coordinate system (rather than a collection of local coordinate charts), which is ideal for describing new identities that provide very natural estimates for the second-fundamental form of the evolving free-boundary $\Gamma(t)$. All of our results apply to general domains, however, via a finite covering of Ω with local coordinate charts and a partition-of-unity subordinate to this cover; in particular, the Stefan problem *localizes* to each chart, and effectively reduces to the analysis on $\Omega = \mathbb{T}^1 \times]0,1[$.

At initial time $t=0$, the *bottom* boundary

$$\Gamma = \mathbb{T}^1 \times \{x^2 = 0\}$$

represents the initial reference boundary of the moving domain $\Gamma(t)$. The *top* boundary $\partial\Omega_{\text{top}} = \mathbb{T}^1 \times \{x^2 = 1\}$ is fixed in time, and the temperature p satisfies the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$:

$$\partial_n p = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_{\text{top}}. \tag{1.2}$$

1.3. **Notation.** For functions defined on the whole domain Ω, we generally use the double bar notation to designate its various Sobolev norms, and for those defined on Γ, we use the single bar notation. In other words, for any $s \geq 0$ and given functions $f:\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi:\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$\|f\|_s := \|f\|_{H^s(\Omega)}; \quad |\varphi|_s := \|\varphi\|_{H^s(\Gamma)}.$$

In particular, when s is not an integer, the corresponding fractional Sobolev space is defined by interpolation in a standard way. If $f\colon [0,T]\times\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi\colon [0,T]\times\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ are given time-dependent functions, then for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ we set

$$\|f\|_{L^p_t H^s_x} := \|f\|_{L^p([0,T];H^s(\Omega))}\|; \; |\varphi|_{L^p_t H^s_x} := \|\varphi\|_{L^p([0,T];H^s(\Gamma))}.$$

If $i = 1,2$ then $f_{,i} := \partial_{x^i} f$ is the partial derivative of f with respect to x^i coordinate. Similarly, $f_{,ij} := \partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j} f$ and so on. When differentiating with respect to the time variable t, we often drop the comma, i.e. $f_t = f_{,t} = \partial_t f$. In order to denote the tangential derivatives we introduce the following notation:

$$\bar\partial f := f_{,1}, \quad \bar\partial^k f := \bar\partial^k_{x^1} f.$$

We use C to denote a universal constant that may vary from line to line. In numerous estimates the sign $\lesssim$ is used: by definition $X \lesssim Y$ if and only if there exists a universal constant C such that $X \leq CY$. We use P to denote a generic real polynomial with positive coefficients that can similarly vary from line to line. We always sum over the repeated indices.

1.4. **The Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) formulation.** In order to obtain a priori estimates, and to facilitate the construction of solutions, we transform the Stefan problem to an equivalent problem on a fixed domain. In many situations, the use of Lagrangian coordinates is most natural for this purpose, but for the Stefan problem, this is not the case. Rather, we make use of the so-called Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) coordinates, which interpolate between the Lagrangian and Eulerian representations.

To this end, we represent

$$\Gamma(t) := \Psi(t,\Gamma)$$

as a graph over Γ. We let $h(t,\cdot):\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the *height function* of the graph over Γ and for $x' \in \mathbb{T}^1$, we define the map

$$\Psi(t,x') = (x', h(t,x'))$$

so that the moving surface $\Gamma(t)$ is parameterized as follows: $\Gamma(t) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 | \; \mathbf{x} = (x', h(t,x'))\}$ where h is the unknown. Note that the outward unit normal $n(t,x')$ in these coordinates, by abuse of notation reads:

$$n(t,x') = \frac{(\bar\partial h, -1)}{\sqrt{1+|\bar\partial h|^2}}.$$

Assuming that h is sufficiently regular and remains a graph, we can define a diffeomorphism $\Psi\colon \Omega\to\Omega(t)$ as a (nonlinear) elliptic extension of the boundary diffeomorphism (x',h), by solving the following nonlinear equation:

$$J(t) := \det D\Psi = |\Omega(t)|/|\Omega| \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.3a}$$

$$\Psi(t,x',0) = (x',h(t,x')) \quad x'\in\Gamma, \tag{1.3b}$$

$$\Psi = \mathrm{Id} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{top}}. \tag{1.3c}$$

Hereby $|U|$ stands for the Lebesgue volume of the set U. Note that $J(0)=1$ and for short times, $J(t)$ will remain close to 1. The existence and regularity of solutions to (1.3) is guaranteed by a theorem of Dacorogna and Moser [20], with the important addition that for $s>0.5$ the following elliptic estimate holds:

$$\|\Psi\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \le C\|\Psi\|_{H^{s-0.5}(\Gamma)}. \tag{1.4}$$

In fact, Dacorogna and Moser prove the result in Hölder spaces, but the argument works in the same fashion in Sobolev spaces of integer order, and in Sobolev spaces of fractional order by linear interpolation. This inequality (1.4) provides optimal control for derivatives of Ψ in Ω. We shall often use the vector $A^2_\bullet$ parallel to n given by

$$A^2_\bullet := \frac{(\bar\partial h,-1)}{J}, \tag{1.5}$$

where we recall $J(t)=|\Omega(t)|/|\Omega|$ by (1.3a).

1.4.1. *ALE change of variables.* We introduce

$$q := p\circ\Psi, \quad A := [D\Psi]^{-1}, \quad w := \Psi_t, \quad v := -\nabla p\circ\Psi. \tag{1.6}$$

Note that the relation $v=-\nabla p\circ\Psi$ transforms into:

$$v^i + A^k_i q,_k = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \tag{1.7}$$

Let us express $p_t\circ\Psi$ in terms of q,v,w. By the chain rule $p_t = q_t\circ\Psi^{-1} + Dq\circ\Psi^{-1}\cdot\Psi^{-1}_t$. Since $\Psi^{-1}_t = -A\circ\Psi^{-1}\Psi_t\circ\Psi^{-1}$ and $w=\Psi_t$, using (1.7) we obtain

$$p_t\circ\Psi = q_t - q,_k A^k_r w^r = q_t + v\cdot w.$$

Recall that the transformed Laplacian in new coordinates simply reads

$$\Delta p\circ\Psi = \Delta_\Psi q = A^j_i (A^k_i q,_k),_j\,.$$

Remark 1 (Differentiation rules). *When differentiating the entries of the matrix $A=[D\Psi]^{-1}$, we use the following identities: for given $i,k\in\{1,2\}$ we have*

$$\partial_t A^k_i = -A^k_r w^r,_s A^s_i; \qquad \bar\partial A^k_i = -A^k_r \bar\partial\Psi^r,_s A^s_i.$$

In particular, simple application of the above identities and product rule imply for any given $a,b\in\mathbb{N}$:

$$\bar\partial^a\partial^b_t A^k_i = -A^k_r\bar\partial^a\partial^b_t\Psi^r,_s A^s_i + \{\bar\partial^a\partial^b_t, A^k_i\}; \quad \{\bar\partial^m\partial^n_t, A^k_i\} := \sum_{l+l'\ge 1} a_{l,l'}\bar\partial^l\partial^{l'}_t(A^k_r A^s_i)\bar\partial^{m-l}\partial^{n-l'}_t\Psi^r,_s\,, \tag{1.8}$$

where the term $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ is the commutator *error. Here the constants $a_{l,l'}$ are some universal constants, depending only on m, n, l and l' (where $0\le l\le m$, $0\le l'\le n$).*

1.4.2. *Classical Stefan problem in ALE variables.* In ALE coordinates, the classical Stefan problem (i.e. problem (1.1) with $\sigma=0$) on the fixed domain Ω is given by the following system of equations:

$$q_t - A^j_i(A^k_i q,_k),_j = -v\cdot w \quad \text{in } \Omega; \tag{1.9a}$$

$$v^i + A^k_i q,_k = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega; \tag{1.9b}$$

$$q = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma; \tag{1.9c}$$

$$\Psi_t\cdot n(t) = -v\cdot n(t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma; \tag{1.9d}$$

$$v\cdot N = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_{\mathrm{top}}; \tag{1.9e}$$

$$q(0,\cdot) = \overset{\circ}{q} = p_0\circ\Psi;\ \Psi(0,\cdot) = \mathrm{Id}(\cdot), \tag{1.9f}$$

where $\mathrm{Id}:\Omega\to\Omega$ denotes the identity map $\mathrm{Id}(x)=x$ and $N=(0,1)$ is the unit normal on $\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{top}}$. Problem (1.9) is the equivalent formulation of the problem (1.1). The map Ψ evolves according to (1.9d) which in turn is coupled to the evolution of q via (1.9a). Associated to it is the following high-order energy functional:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(t)=\mathcal{E}(q,h)(t):=&\sum_{a+2b\leq 4}\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bv\|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x}+\sum_{a+2b\leq 3}\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bv\|^2_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\\&+\sum_{b=0}^{2}\|\partial_t^bq\|^2_{L^\infty_tH^{4-2b}_x}+\sum_{b=0}^{1}\|\partial_t^bq\|^2_{L^2_tH^{4.5-2b}_x}+\sum_{b=0}^{2}|\partial_t^bh|^2_{L^\infty_tH^{4-2b}_x}+\sum_{b=0}^{1}|\partial_t^bh_t|^2_{L^2_tH^{3-2b}_x}\end{aligned}\tag{1.10}$$

Remark 2. *It is helpful to keep in mind that the above spaces are simply space-time parabolic Sobolev spaces, where the formal derivative count works as follows: one time derivative corresponds to two spatial derivatives. For instance,* $q\in L^\infty_tH^4_x$, $q_t\in L^\infty_tH^2_x$, *and* $q_{tt}\in L^\infty_tL^2_x$.

All the time integrals in the L^2-norms above are over the time-interval $[0,t]$. In order to obtain a locally well-posed problem for arbitrarily large initial data, we must impose a sign condition on the normal derivative of p on Γ_0 at time $t=0$:

$$\partial_np_0>0\quad\text{on }\Gamma(0),\tag{1.11}$$

which expressed in terms of q simply reads

$$-(q_0)_{,2}|_{t=0}>0\text{ on }\Gamma.\tag{1.12}$$

The condition (1.12) ensures that on $[0,T]$

$$\lambda(t):=\inf_{x'\in\Gamma}(-q_{,2})(t,x',0)>0\tag{1.13}$$

if $T>0$ is taken sufficiently small. Note that $-q_{,2}=\alpha v\cdot n$ on Γ with v defined by (1.6) and $\alpha=|\bar\partial\Psi|/J\approx 1$. As mentioned in Section 1.1, we shall refer to (1.12) as the *Taylor sign condition* in analogy to the terminology used in the well-posedness theory in fluid mechanics [44, 39]. The Taylor sign assumption emerges naturally in our analysis as a sign condition that gives positive-definiteness of the energy functional.

We shall give a more detailed description of the various norms in the energy function $\mathcal{E}$ below. We define

$$\mathcal{S}(t):=\{(q,h):\ \mathcal{E}(q,h)(t)<\infty\}.\tag{1.14}$$

Our first result is a well-posedness statement for the classical Stefan problem.

Theorem 1.1. *Given initial conditions* $(q_0,h_0)\in\mathcal{S}$ *with* q_0 *satisfying the Taylor sign condition (1.12), the problem (1.9) is locally-in-time well-posed, i.e. there is a* $T>0$ *such that there exists a unique solution* (q,h) *with the initial data* (q_0,h_0) *on the time interval* $[0,T]$. *In addition, there exists a universal constant* $C>0$ *such that:*

$$\mathcal{E}(q,h)\leq 2\mathcal{E}(q_0,h_0).$$

Remark 3. *The definition of our higher-order energy function* $\mathcal{E}$ *restricted to time* $t=0$ *requires an explanation of time-derivates of* q *and* h *at* $t=0$. *Specifically, the values* $q_t|_{t=0}$, $q_{tt}|_{t=0}$, $h_t|_{t=0}$ *and* $h_{tt}|_{t=0}$ *are defined via space-derivatives using equations (1.9a) and (1.9d). To ensure that the solution is continuously differentiable with respect to* t *at* $t=0$ *we must impose corresponding compatibility conditions on the initial data. In particular, restricting (1.9a) to* Γ *and evaluating at time* $t=0$, *we arrive at*

$$(\mathring{q}_0)_{,22}+(\mathring{q}_0)_{,2}^2=0\quad\textit{on}\quad\Gamma.\tag{1.15}$$

It is an easy exercise to see that the set of initial data satisfying (1.15), $\mathring{q}=0$ *on* Γ *and* $\partial_n\mathring{q}=0$ *on* $\partial\Omega_{top}$ *is non-empty. For example, notice that the function* $r(x^1,x^2)=\ln(1+x^2)$ *satisfies the first two conditions in a neighborhood of* Γ. *By employing a partition-of-unity of* Ω, *we ensure that the third condition is also satisfied. Higher regularity on the initial data necessitates the use of more compatibility conditions; they arise by successive time-differentiation of our system of equations. Keeping in mind (1.15) and the fact that (1.9d) at time* $t=0$ *reduces to* $\mathring{h}_t=\mathring{q}_{,2}$ *on* Γ, *we differentiate (1.9a)* *with respect to time. Evaluating it at time* $t=0$ *and restricting the obtained equation to the boundary* Γ*, we obtain the second compatibility condition*

$$-\Psi,^2_{2t}|_{t=0}\mathring{q},_{22}+2\Psi^1,_{2t}|_{t=0}\mathring{q},_{21}+2\mathring{q},_{21}=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma. \tag{1.16}$$

Since we imposed the homogeneous Neumann condition on the top boundary $\partial\Omega_{top}$*, we impose two further compatibility conditions*

$$\mathring{q},_2|_{t=0}=0, \quad \mathring{q},_{222}|_{t=0} \qquad \text{on} \quad \Omega_{top}. \tag{1.17}$$

Our second main result establishes the vanishing surface tension limit. If we replace the boundary condition (1.9c) with

$$q=\sigma\frac{\bar{\partial}^2\Psi\cdot n}{|\bar{\partial}^2\Psi|^2}=-\sigma\frac{\bar{\partial}^2 h}{(1+|\bar{\partial}h|^2)^{3/2}}, \tag{1.18}$$

then the problem (1.9), with (1.18) in lieu of (1.9c), is the ALE version of the Stefan problem with surface tension. To state the main result, we define the high-order energy adapted to the presence of surface tension:

$$\mathcal{E}^\sigma=\mathcal{E}^\sigma(q,h)=\mathcal{E}(q,h)+\sigma\sum_{b=0}^{2}|\partial_t^b h|^2_{L^\infty_t H^{5-2b}_x}+\sigma\sum_{b=0}^{1}|\partial_t^b h_t|^2_{L^2_t H^{4-2b}_x}. \tag{1.19}$$

For a given $T>0$ let

$$C^{1,2}:=\left\{(q,h):\ q\in C^1([0,T];C^0(\Omega))\cap C^0([0,T];C^2(\Omega)),\ h\in C^1([0,T];C^0(\Gamma))\cap C^0([0,T];C^2(\Gamma))\right\} \tag{1.20}$$

with the associated norm

$$\|q,h\|_{C^{1,2}}=\|q\|_{C^0_tC^2_x}+\|q\|_{C^1_tC^0_x}+|h|_{C^0_tC^2_x}+|h|_{C^1_tC^0_x}.$$

Definition 1 (Well prepared data)**.** *A family of initial data* $(q_0^\sigma,h_0^\sigma)_{\sigma\ge0}$ *is well-prepared if it satisfies* **1)** *the compatibility conditions associated to the Stefan problem with surface tension (1.9a), (1.18), (1.9d), (1.9e),* **2)** *the Taylor sign condition (1.12) and finally* **3)** $\mathcal{E}(q_0^\sigma,h_0^\sigma)\to\mathcal{E}(q_0,h_0)$ *as* $\sigma\to0$*.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $(q_0^\sigma,h_0^\sigma)_{\sigma\ge0}$ *be a given family of well-prepared initial conditions in the sense of Definition 1. By* $(q^\sigma,h^\sigma)_{\sigma\ge0}$ *we denote the family of solutions to the associated Cauchy problem for the Stefan problem with surface tension (1.9a), (1.18), (1.9d), (1.9e). There exists a* σ*-independent time* $T>0$ *and a constant* C *depending only on* (q_0,h_0) *such that*

$$\mathcal{E}^\sigma(q^\sigma,h^\sigma)(T)\le C \quad \sigma\ge0.$$

for all $\sigma\ge0$*. As a consequence, the sequence* (q^σ,h^σ) *converges to the unique solution* (q,h) *of the classical Stefan problem (1.9) with* $\sigma=0$ *in the* $C^{1,2}$ *norm.*

Remark 4. *Note that Theorem 1.2 also contains a local-in-time well-posedness statement for the Stefan problem with surface tension under the additional assumption that the Taylor sign condition holds for the initial datum. That condition is, of course, superfluous if one wants to show only local-in-time well-posedness in the presence of surface tension. A straightforward adaptation of our analysis would yield local-in-time well-posedness for the one-phase Stefan problem with surface tension, without any sign condition on* $-q,_2(0,x',0)$*.*

Remark 5. *From the proof of Theorem 1.2 it becomes apparent that we can prove convergence in any functional space that embeds compactly into our energy space. We chose to express this convergence in* $C^{1,2}$*-norm as it guarantees that the limiting solution is a classical one.*

Remark 6. *As in Theorem 1.1, we require suitable compatibility conditions on the initial datum.*

1.5. **Prior results and the motivation for the current treatment.** There is a large amount of literature on the classical one-phase Stefan problem. For a comprehensive overview we refer the reader to MEIRMANOV [36] and VISINTIN [47]. First *weak* solutions were defined by LADYZHENSKAYA, SOLONNIKOV and URALCEVA [34]. These weak solutions were analyzed by FRIEDMAN, KINDERLEHRER [24], [25], [26], CAFARELLI, EVANS [6], [7], wherein the regularity of weak solutions was established. Since the problem satisfies a maximum principle, it is ideally suited to the so-called *viscosity solutions* approach. Existence and regularity of viscosity solutions was established by ATHANASOPOULOS, CAFFARELLI, AND SALSA in [4], [5]. For an exhaustive overview and introduction to the regularity theory of such solutions we refer the reader to CAFFARELLI AND SALSA [8].

Local existence of classical solutions for the classical Stefan problem was shown by MEIRMANOV (see [36] and references therein) and HANZAWA [33]. In the first approach, the author regularizes the problem by adding artificial viscosity to (1.1b) and fixes the moving domain by switching to so-called von Mises variables. The obtained solutions however, lose derivatives with respect to the assumed regularity on the initial data. Similarly, in [33] the author uses Nash-Moser iteration to obtain a local-in-time solution, however again with a significant derivative loss with respect to the initial data. A local existence result for the one-phase n-dimensional Stefan problem is proved in [29], where the required regularity class for the temperature function is $W_p^{2,1}$ with $p>n+2$. For the two-phase Stefan problem a local existence result is presented in [37] in the framework of L^p maximal regularity, where the corresponding functional spaces of Sobolev-type require $p>n+3$, where n is the dimension of the ambient space.

In a related work, local existence for the two-dimensional two-phase Muskat problem (with both different viscosities and different densities) was proved by CÓRDOBA, CÓRDOBA & GANCEDO [15] and in three dimensions in [16]. Their methods rely on a formulation of the problem as a non-local evolution problem for the moving boundary only, whereby the corresponding Taylor sign condition is imposed. In a subsequent work [14], various global existence results were established. An overview can be found in [9].

As to the Stefan problem with surface tension (also known as the Stefan problem with Gibbs-Thomson correction), global weak existence theory (without uniqueness) is developed in [1, 35, 40]. In [27] the authors consider the Stefan problem with small surface tension i.e. $\sigma \ll 1$ whereby (1.1c) is replaced by $v=\sigma\kappa$. Local existence of classical solutions is studied in [38]. In [22] the authors prove a local existence and uniqueness result for classical solutions under a smallness assumption on the initial datum close to flat hypersurfaces . Global existence close to flat hyper-surfaces is proved in [32] and close to stationary spheres for the two-phase problem in [31].

With the Gibbs-Thomson correction, problem (1.1) can account for phenomena such as the phase nucleation, undercooling (superheating) and it is also used in modeling crystal growth [47]. It is a small-scale model as opposed to the macro-scale classical Stefan problem. In this sense, there is a fundamental importance in rigorously understanding the link between the two models. As explained in [47], [46], one can associate a free energy to the Stefan problem with surface tension defined by

$$F_\sigma(\tilde{p},\tilde{\Gamma}) = \int_\Omega \tilde{p}\,dx + \sigma|\tilde{\Gamma}|,$$

where $\tilde{p}$, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ are time-independent. Then in the the sense of Γ-convergence of De Giorgi [21], the free energy $F_\sigma(\tilde{p},\tilde{\Gamma})$ converges to the free energy for the classical Stefan problem, see [47]. This is, however, a completely time-independent consideration and does not address the vanishing σ-limit of time-dependent solutions to the full non-linear problem (1.1). In the context of the water wave problem, the vanishing surface tension limit in two and three dimensions has been studied in [2, 3].

In the case of the Hele-Shaw problem (with no surface tension), due to its ill-posed nature, adding surface tension can in fact have a singular effect on the behavior of the solution. In particular, even in the case of very small surface tension, there is evidence that the vanishing surface tension limit does not converge to the solutions of the problem without surface tension [41, 43, 45, 30]. Thus, the description of surface tension as a *stabilizing* effect for the system, must be subjected to a rigorous verification depending on the problem at hand. In particular, if we think of adding surface tension as a singular perturbation of the zero-surface tension problem, the question whether we can establish the vanishing surface tension limit becomes a-priori unclear.

Turning our attention to the Stefan problem, we can observe that there are two parallel developments in the weak existence theory briefly mentioned above. The first one applies to the classical Stefan problem and it is motivated by the validity of maximum principle: suitable notions of weak/viscosity solutions have been developed [4, 5, 34, 26, 6]. The second development refers to the problem with surface tension and state of the art are the existence results in BV-type space relying on the gradient flow structure of the problem. From the point of view of the vanishing surface tension, it is natural to ask whether the two concepts are compatible in any rigorous mathematical manner. The answer is inconclusive for we lack compactness: while the control on the solutions from [35, 1] is strong enough to pass to some limit as $\sigma \to 0$, it is too weak to guarantee a sharp interface in the limit (in other words, to preclude the formation of so-called "mushy" regions [47]).

We develop a *new* energy method for the Stefan problem with and without surface tension and prove the vanishing surface tension limit. The *well-posedness* is established in L^2-based energy spaces determined naturally by the problem. Such a framework is motivated by the analysis of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations of COUTAND AND SHKOLLER [18], [19].

Precise statements of our results are given in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The estimates that we use are non-linear in nature and they fundamentally exploit the intricate energy structure of the problem. In particular, no derivative loss occurs with respect to the regularity of the initial data. This framework is particularly convenient, as it allows us to rigorously establish the vanishing surface tension limit locally-in-time, as formulated in Theorem 1.2. In this way we link two fundamental models of phase transitions that are valid on different spatial scales, thus answering the open question explained above. In a forthcoming work, we shall extend our results to the two-phase case providing the analogs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

1.6. **Methodology and outline of the paper.** There are two main ingredients in our approach to the Stefan problem. We first introduce the so-called Arbitrary Lagrange-Eulerian variables (from now on referred to as ALE-variables) simultaneously imposing a suitable gauge condition on the change of coordinates - map Ψ. Upon rewriting the problem in the form (1.9), the second main input is the extraction of a high-order energy contribution from the moving boundary, a term of the general form:

$$\int_\Gamma (-q_{,2})|\bar\partial^k\Psi\cdot A^2_\bullet|^2\,dx' \approx \int_\Gamma (-q_{,2})|\bar\partial^k h|^2\,dx', \tag{1.21}$$

for k some positive integer. If we were to stick to the original (Eulerian) framework (1.1), the energy dissipation law would read

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Omega(t)} p(t,x)^2\,dx + \int_{\Omega(t)} |\nabla p(t,x)|^2\,dx = 0.$$

While formally the same as the basic energy structure for the heat equation, the moving boundary contribution exists, but it is only implicitly contained in it. A very important consequence of the ALE-formulation of the problem is to make this contribution clear and transparent, in the form explicitly given by (1.21). Observe that this energy structure incorporates the Taylor sign condition (1.12) in a very natural way, as it becomes a factor whose sign is crucial to the coercivity properties of the quadratic form displayed in (1.21). A further subtlety consists in the discovery of another coercive energy term which is defined on the whole domain Ω (phase), displayed in the fourth line of (2.33). It contains terms of general form

$$\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b q + \bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Psi\cdot v\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \text{ and } \|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b q_t + \bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Psi_t\cdot v\|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x}$$

for a,b as in (2.33). They are *intrinsically* linked to the problem and carry an information about the regularity of the divergence of v; taking $a=0$ and $b=1$ the first term above becomes the norm of the ALE-divergence of v, as it is easily seen from (1.9a):

$$\|q_t + v\cdot w\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} = \|\mathrm{div}_\Psi v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}.$$

The gauge condition (1.3), which relies on a result from [20], allows us to get optimal regularity of the temperature function q. This is possible as we have exact (and in general optimal!) control of the H^s-Sobolev norms of Ψ on the interior, in terms of $H^{s-0.5}$-norm of Ψ on the boundary Γ. This allows us to prove that the energy $\mathcal{E}$ defined in (2.26) is in fact bounded by the coercive quadratic form (the "natural energy") $\mathcal{F}$ (2.33) dictated by the Stefan problem.

Condition (1.11) is the exact equivalent of the Taylor sign condition, necessary for well-posedness of free-surface incompressible Euler equations without surface tension [18] or the water wave problem [48]. If the initial temperature q_0 is nonnegative, it is implied by the Hopf's lemma, at least over a short period of time. In a short time regime, we prove a uniform lower bound on λ (cf. (1.13)), thus enabling us to close the estimates.

In many free-boundary problems, constructing the solution is in general a challenging problem despite the (possible) availability of good a-priori estimates. Our main technical idea to make the construction as straightforward as possible, is to regularize the problem via *horizontal convolution by layers* as introduced in [18] in the study of well-posedness of the incompressible Euler equation on a moving domain. In addition to that, we also regularize the Stefan condition $p=0$ on $\Gamma(t)$ by modifying it into a Robin-type condition. It is carefully designed to fully honor the energy structure of the problem allowing us to prove the basic estimate (Proposition 2.5):

$$\mathcal{E}_\kappa(t)\leq C\mathcal{E}_\kappa(0)+C(t+\sqrt{t})P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa)$$

on its interval of existence ($\mathcal{E}_\kappa$ is defined by (2.26)), where P is some polynomial. Such a polynomial inequality, through a continuity argument leads to uniform-in-κ time of existence $[0,T]$ and the bound

$$\mathcal{E}_\kappa(t)\leq 2C\mathcal{E}_\kappa(0).$$

Passing to the limit as $\kappa\to 0$, we recover the solution of the Stefan problem (1.9). Our regularization is intrinsic to the problem and it does not rely on formulating a sequence of iterated linear problems.

The second part of this work focuses on the problem of the vanishing surface tension limit. Once the well-posedness framework of Theorem 1.1 is set-up, the idea is rather straightforward. Namely, at the level of energy, the presence of surface tension simply augments the high-order energy functional by a σ-dependent contribution coming from the boundary Γ, so to obtain (1.19). The goal is to prove a uniform-in-σ upper bound on $\mathcal{E}^\sigma$ on a σ-independent time interval $[0,T]$. This is made possible by one fundamental property of $\mathcal{E}^\sigma$: it distinguishes between two boundary energy contributions of the general form

$$|\sqrt{-q,_2}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b h|_0^2 \quad\text{and}\quad \sigma|\bar\partial^{a+1}\partial_t^b h|_0^2$$

for suitable $a,b\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Since the error terms are at least of cubic order, we can afford to estimate *all* lower order terms in terms of the *σ-independent* energy term, while the two terms with highest number of derivatives get bounded via the *σ-dependent* energy contribution. With uniform estimates in hand, we can pass to the limit as $\sigma\to 0$.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2.1 we introduce the κ-regularized problem and the associated high-order energy $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$. We then state the energy identities (Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3), prove that $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$ is controlled by the "natural energy" $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ (Proposition 2.4) and finally prove Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. In Section 2.6, we provide the energy estimates for the error terms. Passage to the vanishing surface tension limit is explained in Section 3. In Section 4 we explain how to extend our results to the three dimensional setting.

2. The classical Stefan problem

2.1. A sequence of approximate κ problems.

We regularize the problem by using the *horizontal convolution by layers*, introduced in [18] in the study of well-posedness of the incompressible Euler equation on a moving domain.

Definition 2 (Horizontal convolution by layers)**.** *Let ρ_κ be a $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$-bump function supported in a ball of radius κ defined through: $\rho_\kappa(x):=\frac{1}{\kappa}\rho(\frac{x}{\kappa})$, where*

$$\rho(x)=\begin{cases} c_* e^{-1/(1-|x|^2)}, & |x|<1,\\ 0 \quad |x|\geq 1\end{cases} \tag{2.22}$$

and constant c_* *is such that* $\int_{\mathbb{R}}\rho(x')\,dx'=1$. *For any given* $g:\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ *we define the horizontal convolution by layers of* g *via*

$$\Lambda_\kappa g(x^1,x^2):=\int_\Gamma g(x^1,x^2)\rho_\kappa(x^1-x')\,dx'.$$

To formulate the regularized problem, we introduce the following quantities:

$$\Psi_\kappa(t,x')=(x',h_\kappa(t,x'))\text{ with }h_\kappa(t,x'):=\Lambda_\kappa\Lambda_\kappa h(t,x'),\;x'\in\Gamma$$

and we define Ψ_κ on Ω as an extension of its boundary value on Γ analogously to (1.3). In particular, $J_\kappa:=\det D\Psi_\kappa=|\Omega_\kappa(t)|/|\Omega|$. Furthermore,

$$ {}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}:=[D\Psi_\kappa]^{-1};\quad {}^{\kappa}\!w:=\Psi_{\kappa t}.$$

In analogy to (1.5), we introduce

$$ {}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}^2_\bullet:=\frac{(\bar\partial h_\kappa,-1)}{J_\kappa};\quad {}^{\kappa}\!a:=J_\kappa^{-1}\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}. \tag{2.23}$$

Since J_κ depends only on t, the Piola identity holds: $({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}^k_i)_{,k}=0$ for any $i=1,2$. The κ-regularization of the problem (1.9) takes the form:

$$q_t-{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}^j_i\left({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}^k_i q_{,k}\right)_{,j}=-v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!w\qquad\text{in }\ \Omega; \tag{2.24a}$$

$$v^i+{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}^k_i q_{,k}=0\qquad\text{in }\ \Omega; \tag{2.24b}$$

$$q=-\kappa^2 v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet+\kappa^2\beta(t,x')\qquad\text{on }\ \Gamma; \tag{2.24c}$$

$$\Psi_t\cdot n_\kappa=-v\cdot n_\kappa\qquad\text{on }\ \Gamma; \tag{2.24d}$$

$$v\cdot N=0\qquad\text{on }\ \partial\Omega_{\text{top}}; \tag{2.24e}$$

$$q(0,\cdot)=\overset{\circ}{q}{}^{\kappa},\ \Psi(0,\cdot)=\text{Id}, \tag{2.24f}$$

where $\beta(t,x')$ is defined as

$$\beta(t,x'):=\sum_{k=0}^{3}\frac{t^k}{k!}\partial_t^k(v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet)|_{t=0}. \tag{2.25}$$

Note that $\beta(t,x')$ is a cubic polynomial in t with x'-dependent coefficients. In equation (2.24d), n_κ stands for the outer unit normal with respect to the regularized surface Γ_κ, i.e. in the coordinate representation

$$n_\kappa=\frac{(\bar\partial h_\kappa,-1)}{\sqrt{1+|\bar\partial h_\kappa|^2}}.$$

Note that the corresponding unit tangent to Γ_κ is given via

$$\tau_\kappa=\frac{\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}=\frac{(1,\bar\partial h_\kappa)}{\sqrt{1+|\bar\partial h_\kappa|^2}}.$$

Initial values $q_0^\kappa\in C^\infty(\Omega)$ in (2.24f) are chosen to converge to q_0 in the energy norm, as $\kappa\to0$.

Remark 7 (The regularization)**.** *Note that in addition to the horizontal convolution by layers, we also altered the Stefan boundary condition* $q=0$ *into its regularized version as displayed in (2.24c). Two observations are in order. First, this Robin-type regularization is carefully chosen to be compatible with the non-linear structure of the problem. It fully honors the energy structure and the smoothing effect is seen in the new energy terms that correspond to* κ*-dependent Sobolev norms of* h_t *(2.26). Second, let us assume for the moment that* $\beta(t,x')\equiv0$. *Using (2.24b), we would be able to rewrite (2.24c) as*

$$q=\kappa^2J_\kappa|{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet|^2q_{,2}+\kappa^2q_{,1}\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}^1_\bullet\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet=\kappa^2J_\kappa|{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet|^2q_{,2}+O(\kappa^4).$$

Recalling that $J_\kappa\approx1$ *for short times, to the leading order in* κ *the above expression shows that* q *is negative on* Γ *since* $q_{,2}<0$. *Therefore, the regularization (2.24c) with* $\beta\equiv0$ *is consistent with the Hopf's lemma which tells us that the negativity of* q *inside the domain* Ω *implies* $q_{,2}<0$ *on the boundary.*

Remark 8. *We introduce the regularization (2.24c) to circumvent a technical difficulty of closing the energy estimates at the level of highest-in-time differentiated problem. The problem arises from the commutation of the horizontal convolution operator in terms of the schematic form:*

$$\int_\Gamma \Lambda_\kappa \Lambda_\kappa \Psi_{tt} \cdot \Psi_{ttt} \mathcal{T}\, dx',$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is a lower order term. Of course, when performing a-priori estimates, such an issue does not arise.

Remark 9 (Compatibility conditions)**.** *In order for the solution (q,h) to (2.24) to be continuously differentiable with respect to t at time $t=0$, we must ensure that suitable compatibility conditions on the initial temperature $\mathring{q}$ hold. Due to the introduction of $\kappa^2\beta(t,x')$ term in (2.24c), the compatibility conditions for the κ-regularized problem turn out to be exactly the same as (1.15) and (1.16) (holding for $\mathring{q}^\kappa$ instead of $\mathring{q}$).*

Theorem 2.1 (Smooth solutions to the κ-problem)**.** *For $\kappa>0$ fixed, there is a time T_κ depending on κ, such that there exists a unique solution $q=q(\kappa)$ to (2.24) on the time interval $[0,T_\kappa]$. Because of the compatibility conditions (1.15) - (1.17), the solution satisfies*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{3} \|\partial_t^a q\|_{L^2_t H^{6-2a}_x} < \infty .$$

Proof. Thanks to (2.24b), the boundary condition (2.24c) can be written as

$$-\kappa^2 \nabla q \cdot A_i^\bullet a_i^2 + q = \kappa^2 \beta .$$

As such, (2.24) is a uniformly parabolic equation with C^∞-coefficients, with Neumann boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega_{\text{top}}$ and Robin boundary conditions on Γ. Standard parabolic theory then provides existence and uniqueness of solutions with the stated regularity. □

Remark 10. *A priori, the time of existence $T_\kappa \to 0$ as $\kappa \to 0$. By obtaining κ-independent bounds on solutions to (2.24), we will prove that, in fact, the time of existence is independent of κ and given by $T>0$.*

2.2. The higher-order energy function compatible with the $\kappa \to 0$ asymptotics.

The asymptotically consistent higher-order energy function associated to our sequence of regularized κ-problems is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\kappa = \mathcal{E}_\kappa(q,h) := & \sum_{a+2b\le 4} \|\bar\partial^a \partial_t^b v\|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x} + \sum_{a+2b\le 3} \|\bar\partial^a \partial_t^b v\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \\ & + \kappa^2 \sum_{a+2b\le 4} |\bar\partial^a \partial_t^b h_t|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x} + \kappa^2 \sum_{a+2b\le 3} |\bar\partial^a \partial_t^b h_t|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \\ & + \sum_{b=0}^{2} \|q\|^2_{L^\infty_t H^{4-2b}_x} + \sum_{b=0}^{1} \|q\|^2_{L^2_t H^{4.5-2b}_x} + \sum_{b=0}^{2} |\Lambda_\kappa h|^2_{L^\infty_t H^{4-2b}_x} + \sum_{b=0}^{1} |\partial_t \Lambda_\kappa h|^2_{L^2_t H^{3-2b}_x} \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Remark 11. *Thanks to Theorem 2.1, the function $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$ is continuous in time.*

By choosing T_κ possibly smaller we assume that for certain $\delta>0$

$$\lambda(t) > \delta \text{ and } |\bar\partial h|^2_\infty \le 1/2. \tag{2.27}$$

Since the Taylor sign condition (1.13) holds initially, first assumption is guaranteed by the Hopf's lemma and the second one follows since $\bar\partial h = 0$ initially.

2.3. The energy identities.

In this section we collect the high-order energy identities in two lemmas stated below. We use the notation $\mathcal{T}$ for those error terms which in an easy straightforward way are seen to satisfy the energy bound of the form:

$$|\mathcal{T}| \lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa);$$

this bound will then always follow from the standard $L^\infty - L^2 - L^2$ type estimates.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that (q,h) is a solution to the Stefan problem (1.9) (note that $\sigma=0$). Then the following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^2\int_\Omega|\bar\partial^4v^i|^2+\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\big|\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big|^2+\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega\big(\bar\partial^4q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)^2+\kappa^2\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^4h_t|^2\\&=\int_\Omega\mathcal{R}_1+\int_\Gamma\mathcal{R}_2+\mathcal{T};\end{aligned}\tag{2.28}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^2\int_\Omega|\bar\partial^2\partial_tv^i|^2+\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\big|\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big|^2+\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega\big(\bar\partial^2\partial_tq+\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)^2+\kappa^2\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^2\partial_th_t|^2\\&=\int_\Omega\mathcal{R}_3+\int_\Gamma\mathcal{R}_4+\mathcal{T};\end{aligned}\tag{2.29}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^2\int_\Omega|\partial_t^2v^i|^2+\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\big|\partial_t^2\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big|^2+\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega\big(\partial_t^2q+\partial_t^2\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)^2+\kappa^2\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\partial_{tt}h_t|^2\\&=\int_\Omega\mathcal{R}_5+\int_\Gamma\mathcal{R}_6+\mathcal{T},\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_i$, $i=1,\dots6$ are error terms given below respectively by (2.42), (2.43), (2.44), (2.45), (2.46) and (2.47).

Lemma 2.3. *The following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^2\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega|\bar\partial^3v^i|^2+\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})|\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|^2+\int_\Omega(\bar\partial^3q_t+\bar\partial^3\overset{\kappa}{w}\cdot v)^2+\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^3h_t|^2\\&=\int_\Omega\mathcal{S}_1+\int_\Gamma\mathcal{S}_2+\mathcal{T};\end{aligned}\tag{2.31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^2\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega|\bar\partial v_t|^2+\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})|\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_{tt}\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|^2+\int_\Omega(\bar\partial q_{tt}+\bar\partial\overset{\kappa}{w}_t\cdot v)^2+\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial h_{tt}|^2\\&=\int_\Omega\mathcal{S}_3+\int_\Gamma\mathcal{S}_4+\mathcal{T},\end{aligned}\tag{2.32}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_i$, $i=1,\dots4$ are error terms given below respectively by (2.52), (2.53), (2.54), (2.55)

We postpone the proof of Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 to Section 2.5, since we first want to address the important question of coercivity of the energy $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$ (2.26).

2.4. **Coercivity of the energy $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$.** By summing the left-hand sides of the identities (2.28) - (2.32) from Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, the *natural* coercive quadratic form $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ that arises as the "energy" takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_\kappa=&\sum_{a+2b\le4}\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bv\|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x}+\frac12\sum_{a+2b\le3}\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bv\|^2_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\\&+\kappa^2\sum_{a+2b\le4}|J_\kappa^{-1/2}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bh_t|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x}+\frac{\kappa^2}{2}\sum_{a+2b\le3}|J_\kappa^{-1}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bh_t|^2_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\\&+\frac12\sum_{a+2b\le4;}|\sqrt{-q_{,2}}J_\kappa^{-1/2}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h|^2_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}+\sum_{a+2b\le3}|\sqrt{-q_{,2}}J_\kappa^{-1/2}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h_t|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x}\\&+\frac12\sum_{a+2b\le4;}\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bq+\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|^2_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}+\sum_{a+2b\le3;}\|\bar\partial^a\partial_t^bq_t+\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Psi_{\kappa t}\cdot v\|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.33}$$

The mathematical reason for imposing the Taylor sign condition (1.13) now becomes apparent. In order for the second line in the definition of $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ (2.33) above to make sense we clearly must have

$$\lambda(t):=\inf_{x'\in\Gamma}(-q_{,2})(t,x',0)>0,$$

as it was demanded in (1.13). In order to perform the estimates in the next section, it is crucial to show that the energy $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$ is bounded by $P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$ for some polynomial P. Such a coercivity bound is precisely the content of the next proposition.

Proposition 2.4. *The following inequality holds:*

$$\mathcal{E}_\kappa \lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa).$$

Proof. Due to the Taylor sign assumption (2.27), note that the energy contributions from the boundary Γ in the expressions for $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$ (2.26) and for $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ (2.33), will satisfy the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{b=0}^{2}|\Lambda_\kappa h|^2_{L^\infty_t H^{4-2b}_x}+\sum_{b=0}^{1}|\Lambda_\kappa h_t|^2_{L^2_t H^{3-2b}_x}\\
&\lesssim \sum_{a+2b\le 4;}|\sqrt{-q_{,2}}\,\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}+\sum_{a+2b\le 3}|\sqrt{-q_{,2}}\,\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h_t|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x}.
\end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof of the proposition we must show that the space-time derivatives of q which appear in the energy expression (2.26) are also bounded by $P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$. Thus it remains to prove the following claim:

Claim. The following estimates hold:

(a)

$$\sum_{a+2b\le 4}\|\nabla^a\partial_t^b q\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa),$$

(b)

$$\sum_{a+2b\le 4}\|\nabla^a\partial_t^b q\|_{L^2_t H^{0.5}_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa).$$

Proof of Part (a): It follows from the elliptic theory that $\|q\|_2\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$ since $\Delta_\Psi q=q_t+v\cdot w$ and $\|q_t\|_{L^\infty L^2}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$ and $\|v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\|w\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\le\|v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}|h_t|_{L^\infty_t H^1_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$. Differentiating (2.24a) with respect to x^j $(j=1,2)$, we obtain $\Delta_\Psi q_{,j}=(A_i^m A_i^n)_{,j}\,q_{,mn}+(q_t+v\cdot w)_{,j}$. Furthermore, since $q_{,j}=\Psi_{,j}\cdot v$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|q_{,jt}\| &\lesssim \|\Psi_{,jt}\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}\|v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}+\|\Psi_{,j}\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}\|v_t\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\\
&\lesssim |h_t|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}\|v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}+\|D\Psi\|_{L^\infty_t H^{1.5}}\|v_t\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\\
&\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(v\cdot w)_{,j}\|_{L^\infty_t H^1_x}&\lesssim\|v\|_{L^\infty_t H^1_x}\|w\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}+\|v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\|w_{,j}\|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}\\
&\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)\|q\|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}|h_t|_{L^\infty_t H^1_x}+\mathcal{F}_\kappa|h_t|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa).
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\|({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^m\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^n)_{,j}\,q_{,mn}\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$. Thus, by the elliptic theory again, we conclude

$$\|q\|^2_{L^\infty_t H^3_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa).$$

Differentiating (2.24a) with respect to t, we obtain $\Delta_\Psi q_t=-({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^m\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^n)_{,t}\,q_{,mn}+v_{tt}+(v\cdot{}^{\kappa}w)_t$. Again, using $\|v_{tt}\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim\mathcal{F}_\kappa$, the previous estimates and the bound $|h_t|^2_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$, elliptic regularity implies $\|q_t\|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$. Furthermore $\|q_{tt}\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim\|q_{tt}+{}^{\kappa}w_t\cdot v\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}+\|{}^{\kappa}w_t\cdot v\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$. The last equality follows from the third line on the definition (2.26) of $\mathcal{F}_\kappa$ and a simple bound on the $L^\infty_t L^\infty_x$-norm of v, which follows from Sobolev embedding. Finally, choose any $j,k\in\{1,2\}$. Applying $\partial_{x^j}\partial_{x^k}$ to (2.24a), we arrive at the elliptic equation

$$\Delta_\Psi q_{,jk}=-({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^m\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^n)_{,j}\,q_{,mnk}-({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^m\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^n)_{,k}\,q_{,mnj}-({}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^m\,{}^{\kappa}\!\mathcal{A}_i^n)_{,jk}\,q_{,mn}+(q_t+v\cdot{}^{\kappa}w)_{,jk}\,.$$

By the estimates already derived before and the definition (2.26), the right-hand side is bounded by $P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$ in $L^\infty_t L^2_x$-norm. Thus, by elliptic regularity, we finally conclude $\|q\|_{L^\infty H^4}\lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa)$,concluding the proof of part (a) of the lemma.

Proof of Part (b): The easiest case is $b=2$. For $j=1,2$, we have

$$q_{,jtt}=(\Psi_{\kappa,j}\cdot v)_{tt}=\Psi_{\kappa,jtt}\cdot v+2\Psi_{\kappa,jt}\cdot v_t+\Psi_{\kappa,j}\cdot v_{tt}.$$

From the above we easily infer

$$\int_0^t \|Dq_{tt}\|_{-0.5}^2 \lesssim \int_0^t \|\Psi_{tt}\|_{0.5}^2\|v\|_\infty^2 + \|\Psi_{\kappa,jt}\|_\infty^2\|v_t\|_0^2 + \|\Psi_{\kappa,j}\|_\infty^2\|v_{tt}\|_0^2 \lesssim P(\mathcal{F}_\kappa).$$

Since $\|q_{tt}\|_{0.5}^2 \lesssim \|q_{tt}\|_0^2 + \|Dq_{tt}\|_{-0.5}^2$, we conclude the claim when $b=2$. The rest of the proof relies on the estimates established in part (a) of the lemma and the elliptic estimates just like in the proof of part (a). □

2.5. **Proof of Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3.** *Proof of Lemma 2.2.* Applying the tangential differential operator $\bar\partial^4$ to the equation (2.24b), multiplying it by $\bar\partial^4 v^i$ and integrating over Ω, we obtain

$$\big(\bar\partial^4 v^i + \bar\partial^4 \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k q_{,k} + \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2} = \sum_{l=1}^{3} c_l \big(\bar\partial^l \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^{4-l} q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2}, \tag{2.34}$$

where $c_l = \binom{4}{l}$. Recalling (1.8), we write

$$\bar\partial^4 \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k = -\overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_{\kappa,s} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k + \{\bar\partial^4, \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k\}, \tag{2.35}$$

where $\{\bar\partial^4, \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k\}$ stands for the lower order commutator defined in (1.8). With this identity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\bar\partial^4 \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2(\Omega)} = -\big(\overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_{\kappa,s} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \big(\{\bar\partial^4, \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k\} q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&= -\int_\Gamma q_{,k} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k \bar\partial^4 v^i N^s + \int_\Omega \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k q_{,k} \bar\partial^4 v^i_{,s} + \mathcal{T}\\
&= -\int_\Gamma q_{,k} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k \bar\partial^4 v^i N^s - \int_\Omega \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa v^r \bar\partial^4 v^i_{,s} + \mathcal{T}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

where we used $(\overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s)_{,s} = 0$ and the identity $v^r = -\overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k q_{,k}$ to write the last line more concisely. Furthermore, integrating by parts with respect to x^k

$$\big(\overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2} = \int_\Omega \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 q_{,k} \bar\partial^4 v^i = \int_\Gamma \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 q \bar\partial^4 v^i \cdot N^k - \int_\Omega \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 q \bar\partial^4 v^i_{,k}. \tag{2.37}$$

Note that the the boundary contribution coming from the fixed boundary $\partial\Omega_{\text{top}}$ vanishes due to the boundary condition (2.24e), which further reduces to $v^2 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_{\text{top}}$. Summing (2.36) and (2.37), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\bar\partial^4 \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k q_{,k} + \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 q_{,k}, \bar\partial^4 v^i\big)_{L^2(\Omega)} &= -\int_\Gamma q_{,k} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k \bar\partial^4 v^i N^s + \int_\Gamma \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \partial^4 q \partial^4 v^i \cdot N^k\\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^k \bar\partial^4 v^i{}_{,k} \big(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4 \Psi_\kappa \cdot v\big) + \mathcal{T}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

The first three terms on the right-hand side of (2.38) will be the source of positive definite quadratic contributions to the energy. To extract the quadratic coercive contribution from the first integral on the right-hand side of (2.38), we simplify it to

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int_\Gamma q_{,k} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^s \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^k \bar\partial^4 v^i N^s &= \int_\Gamma (-q_{,2}) \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^2 \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^2 \bar\partial^4 v^i - \int_\Gamma q_{,1} \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_i^2 \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^1 \bar\partial^4 v^i\\
&= \int_\Gamma (-q_{,2}) \bar\partial^4 \Psi_\kappa \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2 \bar\partial^4 v \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2 - \int_\Gamma q_{,1} \bar\partial^4 \Psi^r_\kappa \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_r^1 \bar\partial^4 v \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We rewrite the expression $\bar\partial^4 v \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2$ and thereby use the boundary condition (2.24d):

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar\partial^4 v \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2 &= \bar\partial^4 w \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2 + \bar\partial^4 (v-w) \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2\\
&= \bar\partial^4 w \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2 + \bar\partial^4 \big(\underbrace{(v-w) \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2}_{=0}\big) - \sum_{l=1}^{4} a_l \bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w) \cdot \bar\partial^l \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2\\
&= \bar\partial^4 w \cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2 - \sum_{l=1}^{4} a_l \bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w) \cdot \bar\partial^l \overset{\kappa}{A}{}_\bullet^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the above identity and recalling $\Psi_\kappa = \Lambda_\kappa\Lambda_\kappa\Psi$, we obtain

(2.39)
$$\int_\Gamma (-q,_2)\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot n_\kappa\bar\partial^4 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\kappa = \int_\Gamma (-q,_2)\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4 w\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet - \sum_{l=1}^4 a_l\int_\Gamma (-q,_2)\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^l\, {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet.$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (2.39) is rewritten in the following way

(2.40)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Gamma (-q,_2)\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4 w\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet = \int_\Gamma (-q,_2)\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\
&\quad+\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q,_2)\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big] - (-q,_2)\big(\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big]\\
&=\frac12\partial_t\int_\Gamma(-q,_2)\big|\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big|^2 - \frac12\int_\Gamma(-q,_{2t})\big|\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big|^2 - \int_\Gamma(-q,_2)\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_{\bullet t}\\
&\quad+\int_\Gamma \Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q,_2)\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big] - (-q,_2)\big(\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big]\\
&=\frac12\partial_t\int_\Gamma(-q,_2)\big|\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big|^2 + \int_\Gamma \Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q,_2)\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big] - (-q,_2)\big(\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big] + \mathcal{T}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (2.38) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Gamma {}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^4 q\bar\partial^4 v^i\cdot N^k &= -\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^4 q\bar\partial^4 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet = \kappa^2\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^4 h_t\big(\bar\partial^4(v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet) - \sum_{l=0}^3 a_l\bar\partial^l v\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big) + \kappa^2\int_\Gamma\beta(t,x')\bar\partial^4 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\
&= \kappa^2\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^4 h_t|^2 - \kappa^2\sum_{l=0}^3 a_l\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^4 h_t\bar\partial^l v\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet + \kappa^2\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^4\beta(t,x')\bar\partial^4 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the boundary condition (2.24c) in the second equality above (recall $v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet = w\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet = h_t$). As to the third term on the right-hand side of (2.38), note that

$${}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^4 v^i,_k = \bar\partial^4({}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i v^i,_k) - \sum_{l=1}^4 c_l\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^{4-l}v^i,_k = -\bar\partial^4(q_t + v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!w) - \sum_{l=1}^4 c_l\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^{4-l}v^i,_k\,,$$

where ${}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i v^i,_k = -\mathrm{div}_{\Psi_\kappa}v = -(q_t + v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!w)$ by the parabolic equation (2.24a). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\int_\Omega {}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^4 v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)\\
&= \int_\Omega\bar\partial^4(q_t + \Psi_{\kappa t}\cdot v)\big(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big) + \sum_{l=1}^4 c_l\int_\Omega\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^{3-l}v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)\\
&= \frac12\partial_t\int_\Omega\left(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)^2 + \int_\Omega\big(\sum_{l=1}^4 d_l\bar\partial^{4-l}\Psi_{\kappa t}\cdot\bar\partial^l v - \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v_t\big)\big(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)\\
&\quad+\sum_{l=1}^4 c_l\int_\Omega\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^{3-l}v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{2.41}$$

Combining (2.38), (2.39), (2.40) and (2.41) we obtain the identity (2.28) with the error terms $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ given by:

(2.42)
$$\mathcal{R}_1 := \sum_{l=1}^3 c_l\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^{4-l}q,_k\bar\partial^4 v^i - \big(\sum_{l=1}^4 c_l\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^k_i\bar\partial^{4-l}v^i,_k + \sum_{l=1}^4 d_l\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!w\cdot\bar\partial^l v - \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v_t\big)\big(\bar\partial^4 q + \bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big);$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_2 :=\ & -\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q,_2)\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big] - (-q,_2)\big(\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big]\\
&+\sum_{l=1}^4 a_l(-q,_2)\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet + q,_1\bar\partial^4\Psi^r_\kappa\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^1_r\bar\partial^4 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet + \kappa^2\sum_{l=0}^3 a_l\bar\partial^4 h_t\bar\partial^l v\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\
&-\kappa^2\bar\partial^4\beta\bar\partial^4 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.43}$$

Applying the tangential differential operator $\bar\partial^2\partial_t$ to the equation (2.24b), multiplying it by $\bar\partial^2\partial_t v^i$ and integrating over Ω, we obtain in a completely analogous fashion identity (2.29) claimed in Lemma 2.2 with error terms $\mathcal{R}_3$ and $\mathcal{R}_4$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_3 := &\sum_{1\le m+n\le 2} c_{mn}\bar\partial^m\partial_t^n {}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^{2-m}\partial_t^{1-n}q_{,k}\bar\partial^2\partial_t v^i - \Big(\sum_{1\le m+n\le 2} c_{mn}\bar\partial^m\partial_t^n {}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^{2-m}\partial_t^{1-n}v^i{}_{,k}\\ &+\sum_{0\le m+n\le 2} d_{mn}\bar\partial^m\partial_t^n\Psi_{\kappa t}\cdot\bar\partial^{2-m}\partial_t^{1-n}v-\bar\partial^2\Psi_{\kappa t}\cdot v_t\Big)\times\big(\bar\partial^2 q_t+\bar\partial^2\Psi_{\kappa t}\cdot v\big);\end{aligned}\tag{2.44}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_4 := &-\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^2\Psi_t\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q_{,2})\big(\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Psi_t\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big]-(-q_{,2})\big(\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\Big]\\ &+\sum_{l+l'\ge 1}a_{l,l'}\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^l\partial_t^{l'}\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^{2-l}\partial_t^{1-l'}(v-w)\cdot\partial_t^l{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\\ &+q_{,1}\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Psi_\kappa^r{}^\kappa\!A_r^1\bar\partial^2\partial_t v\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet+\kappa^2\sum_{0\le l+l'<3}\bar\partial^2\partial_t h_t\bar\partial^l\partial_t^{l'}v\cdot\bar\partial^{2-l}\partial_t^{1-l'}{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet-\kappa^2\bar\partial^2\partial_t\beta\bar\partial^2\partial_t v\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet.\end{aligned}\tag{2.45}$$

Finally, applying ∂_{tt} to the equation (2.24b), multiplying it by $\partial_{tt}v^i$ and integrating over Ω, the last identity (2.30) of Lemma 2.2 follows with error terms $\mathcal{R}_5$ and $\mathcal{R}_6$ given by

$$\mathcal{R}_5 := -\big({}^\kappa\!A_i^k{}_{,tt}v^i{}_{,k}+2{}^\kappa\!A_i^k{}_{,t}v^i{}_{,kt}+2v_t\cdot{}^\kappa w_t+v_{tt}\cdot{}^\kappa w-\Psi_{\kappa tt}\cdot v_t\big)(q_{tt}+\Psi_{\kappa tt}\cdot v);\tag{2.46}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_6 := &-\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_{tt}\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q_{,2})\big(\Psi_{ttt}\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big]-(-q_{,2})\big(\partial_{tt}\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\Big]\\ &+\sum_{l=1}^2 a_l^2\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\partial_t^2\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\partial_t^{2-l}(v-w)\cdot\partial_t^l{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet+q_{,1}\partial_{tt}\Psi_\kappa^r{}^\kappa\!A_r^1\partial_{tt}v\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet+\kappa^2\sum_{l'=0}^1\partial_{tt}h_t\partial_t^{l'}v\partial_t^{2-l'}{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\\ &-\kappa^2\partial_{tt}\beta\partial_{tt}v\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet.\end{aligned}\tag{2.47}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2.3.

Applying the tangential operator $\bar\partial^3\partial_t$ to the equation (2.24b), multiplying by $\bar\partial^3 v^i$ and integrating over Ω we obtain

$$\big(\bar\partial^3\partial_t v^i,\bar\partial^3 v^i\big)_{L^2}+\big(\bar\partial^3\partial_t({}^\kappa\!A_i^k q_{,k}),\bar\partial^3 v^i\big)_{L^2}=0,$$

implying

$$\frac12\partial_t\int_\Omega|\bar\partial^3 v^i|^2+\big(\bar\partial^3\partial_t{}^\kappa\!A_i^k q_{,k}+{}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^3\partial_t q_{,k},\bar\partial^3 v^i\big)_{L^2}=\sum_{\substack{l+\bar l=3,\,k+\bar k=1\\ 0<l+k<4}}c_{l,k,\bar l,\bar k}\big(\bar\partial^l\partial_t^k{}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^{\bar l}\partial_t^{\bar k}q_{,k},\bar\partial^3 v^i\big)_{L^2}.\tag{2.48}$$

Recalling (1.8), we write

$$\bar\partial^3\partial_t{}^\kappa\!A_i^k=-{}^\kappa\!A_r^k\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w^r{}_{,s}{}^\kappa\!A_i^s+\{\bar\partial^3\partial_t,{}^\kappa\!A_i^k\}.\tag{2.49}$$

Using this decomposition we have

$$\big(\bar\partial^3\partial_t{}^\kappa\!A_i^k q_{,k}+{}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^3\partial_t q_{,k},\bar\partial^3 v^i\big)_{L^2}=-\int_\Omega{}^\kappa\!A_r^k\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w^r{}_{,s}{}^\kappa\!A_i^s q_{,k}\bar\partial^3 v^i+\int_\Omega{}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^3\partial_t q_{,k}\bar\partial^3 v^i+\mathcal{T},\tag{2.50}$$

where the commutator term has been absorbed in the error $\mathcal{T}$. Integrating by parts with respect to s and k in the first two integrals on the right-hand side above respectively, we obtain analogously to the proof of Lemma 2.2:

$$\begin{aligned}&-\int_\Omega{}^\kappa\!A_r^k\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w^r{}_{,s}{}^\kappa\!A_i^s q_{,k}\bar\partial^3 v^i+\int_\Omega{}^\kappa\!A_i^k\bar\partial^3\partial_t q_{,k}\bar\partial^3 v^i\\ &=\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^3 w\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet-\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3\partial_t q\bar\partial^3 v\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet-\int_\Gamma q_{,1}{}^\kappa\!A_r^1\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w^r\bar\partial^3 v\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\\ &+\int_\Omega(\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w\cdot v)^2+\int_\Omega\Big(\sum_{l=1}^3 d_l\bar\partial^{3-l}w\cdot\bar\partial^l v+\sum_{l=1}^3 e_l\bar\partial^l A_i^s v^{3-l}v^i{}_{,s}\Big)\big(\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3{}^\kappa w\cdot v\big)+\mathcal{T}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.51}$$

Note further that the first term on the right-hand side above can be, similarly to (2.40), further written as

$$\int_\Gamma (-q_{,2})\bar\partial^3 \overset{\kappa}{w}\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet \bar\partial^3 w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet = \int_\Gamma (-q_{,2})|\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|^2 + \int_\Gamma \Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^3 w\cdot \big[\Lambda_\kappa[(-q_{,2})(\bar\partial^3 w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet] \\ -(-q_{,2})(\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big].$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (2.51) reads, using the boundary condition (2.24c)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^3\partial_t q\bar\partial^3 v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet &= \kappa^2\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^3\partial_t h_t\big(\bar\partial^3(v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet) - \sum_{l=0}^2 c_l\bar\partial^l v\cdot\bar\partial^{3-l}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big) + \kappa^2\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^3\partial_t\beta\bar\partial^3 v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet \\ &= \frac{\kappa^2}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^3 h_t|^2 - \kappa^2\sum_{l=0}^2 c_l\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^3\partial_t h_t\bar\partial^l v\cdot\bar\partial^{3-l}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet + \kappa^2\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^3\partial_t\beta\bar\partial^3 v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet + \mathcal{T},\end{aligned}$$

where the error term $\mathcal{T}$ is used to absorb the lower order terms containing the time derivative of J_κ. We also used the regularized boundary condition (2.24c) in the first equality above. Combining (2.48) - (2.51) and the last identity we obtain the identity (2.31) with error terms $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ given by (2.52)

$$\mathcal{S}_1 := \sum_{\substack{l+\bar l=3,\, k+\bar k=1\\ 0<l+k<4}} c_{l,k,\bar l,\bar k}\bar\partial^l\partial_t^k A_i^k\bar\partial^{\bar l}\partial_t^{\bar k} q_{,k} - \big(\sum_{l=1}^3 d_l\bar\partial^{3-l} w\cdot\bar\partial^l v + \sum_{l=1}^3 e_l\bar\partial^l A_i^s\bar\partial^{3-l} v^i{}_{,s}\big)\big(\bar\partial^3 q_t + \bar\partial^3\overset{\kappa}{w}\cdot v\big);$$

(2.53)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_2 :=& -\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^3 w\cdot\big[\Lambda_\kappa[(-q_{,2})(\bar\partial^3 w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet] - (-q_{,2})(\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big] \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^3 c_l(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^3\overset{\kappa}{w}\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet(\bar\partial^{3-l}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet) + q_{,1}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^1_r\bar\partial^3\overset{\kappa}{w}{}^r\bar\partial^3 v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet + \kappa^2\sum_{l=0}^2 c_l\bar\partial^3\partial_t h_t\bar\partial^l v\cdot\bar\partial^{3-l}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet \\ &-\kappa^2\bar\partial^3\partial_t\beta\bar\partial^3 v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the tangential operator $\bar\partial\partial_t^2$ to the equation (2.24b), multiplying by $\bar\partial\partial_t v^i$ and integrating over Ω we obtain the identity (2.32) in an analogous way, with error terms $\mathcal{S}_3$ and $\mathcal{S}_4$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_3 :=& \big(v_{,s}\cdot\bar\partial\Psi_{\kappa tt}A_i^s - \{\bar\partial\partial_t^2, A_i^k\}q_{,k}\big)\bar\partial v_t^i + \sum_{1\le m+n\le 2} c_{mn}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b A_i^k\bar\partial^{1-a}\partial_t^{2-b} q_{,k}\bar\partial v_{tt}^i \\ &+\big(\sum_{1\le m+n\le 2} d_{mn}\bar\partial^a\partial_t^b A_i^s\bar\partial^{1-a}\partial_t^{1-b} v^i{}_{,s} - (\Psi_{tt}\cdot\bar\partial v + \bar\partial\Psi_t\cdot v_t + \Psi_t\bar\partial v_t)\big)\big(\bar\partial q_{tt} + \bar\partial\Psi_{\kappa tt}\cdot v\big);\end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_4 :=& (-q_{,2})\bar\partial w_t\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big[(\bar\partial(v-w)\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_{\bullet t}) + (w_t - v_t)\cdot\bar\partial\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet + (w-v)\cdot\bar\partial\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_{\bullet t}\big] \\ &-\bar\partial\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big((-q_{,2})A^2_\bullet\bar\partial\partial_t w\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big) - (-q_{,2})\bar\partial\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa w\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\Big] \\ &+q_{,1}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^1_r\bar\partial\partial_t\overset{\kappa}{w}{}^r\bar\partial\partial_t v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet + \kappa^2\bar\partial\partial_t h_t(\bar\partial\partial_t(v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet) - \bar\partial\partial_t v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet) - \kappa^2\bar\partial\partial_{tt}\beta\bar\partial\partial_t v\cdot \overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet.\end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

□

2.6. **Estimates.** The following proposition states the desired energy bound for the classical Stefan problem ($\sigma = 0$), that will subsequently allow to obtain a uniform-in-κ existence interval for our family of regularized problems (2.24).

Proposition 2.5. *There exists a constant C independent of κ and a universal polynomial P such that for any $t\in[0,T^\kappa]$ the following bound holds*

$$\mathcal{E}_\kappa(t) \le C\mathcal{E}_\kappa(0) + C(t+\sqrt{t})P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

Proof. The proof of the proposition proceeds by systematically estimating error terms in the energy identities from Section 2.3:

Estimates for $\int_0^t\int_\Omega \mathcal{R}_1$. **Term:** $\sum_{l=1}^3 \int_0^t\int_\Omega c_l \bar\partial^l\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k \bar\partial^{4-l} q,_k \bar\partial^4 v^i$**.** If $l=1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k \bar\partial^3 q,_k \bar\partial^4 v^i\Big| &\le \|\bar\partial\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty}\int_0^t \|\bar\partial^3 q,_k\|_{L^2}\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L^2}\\ &\lesssim \|\int_0^t \bar\partial\partial_t({}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k)\|_{H^{1.5}}\|\bar\partial^3 q,_k\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\\ &\le \sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^2H_x^{3.5}}\|\bar\partial^3 q,_k\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\lesssim \sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

For $l=2,3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial^l\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k \bar\partial^{4-l} q,_k \bar\partial^4 v^i\Big| &\lesssim \|\bar\partial^l\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{0.5}}\|\bar\partial^{4-l} q,_k\|_{H^{0.5}}\int_0^t \|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L^2}\\ &\lesssim \sqrt{t}\|D(\Psi_\kappa - Id\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\|q\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{3.5}}\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\lesssim \sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Term: $\sum_{l=1}^4 c_l\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial^l\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\bar\partial^{4-l}v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)$**.** Only cases $l=1$ and $l=4$ deserve special attention, while the cases $l=2$ and $l=3$ are estimates in the usual way. If $l=1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\bar\partial^3 v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)\Big| \le \int_0^t \|\bar\partial\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\|_{0.5}\||\bar\partial|^{2.5}v^i,_k\|_{L^2}\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_0\\ &+\|\bar\partial\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^\infty}\int_0^t \||\bar\partial|^{2.5}v^i,_k\|_{L^2}\left(\|\bar\partial^4 q\|_{0.5}+\|(\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v)\|_{0.5}\right)\\ &\lesssim \|\int_0^t D^2\partial_t({}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k)\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\int_0^t \|q\|_{4.5}\big(\|\bar\partial^4 q\|_{0.5}+\|\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_{0.5}\big)+\|\int_0^t\bar\partial\partial_t({}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k)\|_{H^{1.5}}\int_0^t\|q\|_{4.5}^2\\ &+\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{1.5}}\|v\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{0.5}}\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\int_0^t\|q\|_{4.5}\\ &\lesssim \sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^2H_x^3}\|q\|_{L_t^2H_x^{4.5}}^2+\sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^2H_x^3}\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\int_0^t\|q\|_{4.5}+C\sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^2H_x^{3.5}}\int_0^t\|q\|_{4.5}^2\\ &+C\sqrt{t}\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{1.5}}\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\|q\|_{L_t^2H_x^{4.5}}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

As for the case $l=4$, we estimate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial^4\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)\Big|\le\int_0^t\int_\Omega \||\bar\partial|^{3.5}\,{}^\kappa\!\mathcal{A}_i^k\|_{L^2}\||\bar\partial|^{0.5}[v^i,_k\left(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\right)]\|_{L^2}\\ &\le\int_0^t\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{2.5}\|v^i,_k\|_{W^{0.5,\infty}}\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_{0.5}\le\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\|q\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{3.5}}\int_0^t(\|q\|_{4.5}+\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{2.5})\\ &\le\sqrt{t}\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\|q\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{3.5}}\|q\|_{L_t^2H_x^{4.5}}+t\|q\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{3.5}}\|D^2\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}^2\lesssim(\sqrt{t}+t)P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Term: $\sum_{l=1}^4 d_l\int_0^t\int_\Omega\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^\kappa w\cdot\bar\partial^l v\big(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)$**.** If $l=4$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega {}^\kappa w\cdot\bar\partial^4 v\big(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)\Big| &\le\int_0^t\|{}^\kappa w\|_\infty\|\bar\partial^4 v\|_0\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_0\\ &\le\sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{1.5}}\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|\bar\partial^4 v\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa);\end{aligned}$$

and analogously for $l=3$

$$\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega\bar\partial\,{}^\kappa w\cdot\bar\partial^3 v\big(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)\Big|\le\sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{2.5}}\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|\bar\partial^3 v\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

For $l=1,2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega\bar\partial^l\,{}^\kappa w\cdot\bar\partial^{4-l}v\big(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)\Big| &\le\int_0^t\|\bar\partial^l\,{}^\kappa w\|_0\|\bar\partial^{4-l}v\|_\infty\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_0\\ &\le\sqrt{t}\|{}^\kappa w\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2}\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|q\|_{L_t^2H_x^{4.5}}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

The last term on the right-hand side of (2.42) is estimated as follows:

$$\Big|\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v_t\big(\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\big)\Big|\le\sqrt{t}\|\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|\bar\partial^4 q+\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|v_t\|_{L_t^2H_x^{1.5}}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

Estimates for $\int_0^t\int_\Gamma \mathcal{R}_2$. To estimate the first term on the right-hand side of (2.43), we need an additional lemma to deal with the commutator term:

Lemma 2.6 ([19], Lemma 5.1)**.** *For* $F\in W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma)$ *and* $G,\bar\partial G\in L^2(\Gamma)$, *there is a generic constant* C *independent of* κ *such that*

$$\big|\Lambda_\kappa(F\bar\partial G)-f\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial G\big|\le C|F|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma)}|G|_0,$$

where $W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma)$ *denotes the Sobolev space of functions* $h\in L^\infty(\Gamma)$ *with weak derivative* $\bar\partial h\in L^\infty(\Gamma)$.

For any $i,j\in\{1,2\}$ set $F=q_{,2}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_i\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_j$, $G=\bar\partial^3\Psi_t^i$ and apply Lemma 2.6 to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t\Big|\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q_{,2})\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big]-(-q_{,2})\big(\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\Big|^2&\lesssim\int_0^t|q_{,2}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet:\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|^2_{W^{1,\infty}(\Gamma)}|w|_3^2\\ \lesssim\sup_{0\le s\le t}|q_{,2}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet:\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|_2^2\int_0^t|w|_3^2\lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa),\end{aligned}$$

where we estimate $|w|_{L^2_tH^3_x}$ using the equation (2.24d):

$$|h_t|^2_{L^2_tH^3_x}\lesssim\int_0^t\big|\bar\partial^3\big(\sqrt{1+|\bar\partial h_\kappa|^2}(v\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet)\big)\big|^2\lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa)\int_0^t\|q\|^2_{4.5}\lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa). \tag{2.56}$$

Note that we bounded $|v|_3$ by relating it to its norm over Ω via the trace estimate:

$$|v|^2_{L^2_tH^3_x}\lesssim\|v\|^2_{L^2_tH^{3.5}_x}\lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa)\int_0^t\|q\|^2_{4.5}\lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa). \tag{2.57}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q_{,2})\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_t\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big]-(-q_{,2})\big(\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big)\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\Big]\Big|\\&\qquad\lesssim P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa)^{1/2}\Big(\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\big|\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^4\Psi\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\lesssim tP(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we treat the last term on the right-hand side of (2.43). For $1\le l\le 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet&\le|-q_{,2}\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|_{L^\infty_tL^\infty_x}\int_0^t|\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|_0|\bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w)|_0\\ \lesssim|-q_{,2}|_{L^\infty_tH^1_x}|\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|_{L^\infty_tH^1_x}|\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}\sqrt{t}\big(|v|_{L^2_tH^3_x}+|w|_{L^2_tH^3_x}\big)&\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa),\end{aligned}$$

where estimates (2.56) and (2.57) were used in the last inequality. If $l=3$, we apply a similar estimate, bounding the term $\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet=\bar\partial^3\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet$ in L^2-norm and $\bar\partial^{4-l}(v-w)=\bar\partial(v-w)$ via L^∞ norm and Sobolev embedding leading to adesired bound:

$$\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^3\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\Big|\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa)$$

Case $l=4$ is the trickiest error term as four derivatives hit $\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet$, thus creating a term that at highest order contains five derivatives of Ψ, being above the energy space regularity allowed for Ψ. The following lemma proves that this term is indeed of lower order, relying on its specific structure and integration by parts:

Lemma 2.7. *The following identity holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet&=-\frac12\int_\Gamma\bar\partial\Big[(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}\Big]\big(\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big)^2\\&-\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\bar\partial\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet+\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet E,\end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

where E *is the error term specified in (2.59) below.*

Remark 12. *Before we proceed to the proof, note that the the function* Ψ *enters the right-hand side of the above identity at most with* 4 *derivatives. This fact enables us to perform the energy estimates.*

Proof. Note that

$$v-w=(v-w)\cdot n_\kappa n_\kappa+(v-w)\cdot\tau_\kappa\tau_\kappa=(v-w)\cdot\tau_\kappa\tau_\kappa$$

where we used the boundary condition (2.24d). We may thus write

$$\begin{aligned}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet&=(v-w)\cdot\tau_\kappa\tau_\kappa\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet=-w\cdot\tau_\kappa\tau_\kappa\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\&=w\cdot\tau_\kappa\bar\partial^4\tau_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet+\sum_{l=1}^{3}e_l w\cdot\tau_\kappa\bar\partial^l\tau_\kappa\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet,\end{aligned}$$

where we first used the identity $v\cdot\tau_\kappa=0$ and in the last line we used the product rule expansion of the the identity $0=\bar\partial^4(\tau_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet)$ with e_l the expansion coefficients. Since $\tau_\kappa=\frac{\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\partial^4\tau_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet&=\frac{\bar\partial^5\Psi_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet+\sum_{l=1}^{3}e_l\bar\partial^{l+1}\Psi_\kappa\bar\partial^{4-l}(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet+\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa\bar\partial^4(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\&=\frac{\bar\partial^5\Psi_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet+\sum_{l=1}^{3}e_l\bar\partial^{l+1}\Psi_\kappa\bar\partial^{4-l}(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet,\end{aligned}$$

where we simply used the product rule to expand $\bar\partial^4(\frac{\bar\partial\Psi}{|\bar\partial\Psi|})$ and the orthogonality of $\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa$ and ${}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet$ in the last line. Combining the previous two identities, we may write

$$(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet=\frac{\bar\partial^5\Psi_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet w\cdot\tau_\kappa+E,$$

where the error term E is given by

$$E=w\cdot\tau_\kappa\sum_{l=1}^{3}e_l\bar\partial^{l+1}\Psi_\kappa\bar\partial^{4-l}(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet+\sum_{l=1}^{3}e_l w\cdot\tau_\kappa\bar\partial^l\tau_\kappa\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet.\tag{2.59}$$

We thus obtain

$$\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet=\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^5\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet+\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet E.$$

Note that first integral on the right-hand side has a symmetry allowing us to extract a full tangential derivative of the level of highest order terms:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^5\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\&\quad=\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}\bar\partial[(\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet)^2]-\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\partial\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\\&\quad=-\frac{1}{2}\int_\Gamma\bar\partial[(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}](\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet)^2-\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\frac{w\cdot\tau_\kappa}{|\bar\partial\tau_\kappa|}\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\bar\partial\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet,\end{aligned}$$

where we used integration by parts in the second equation. Finally, summing the previous two identities we arrive at (2.58). ☐

By standard $L^\infty-L^2-L^2$ type estimates and Lemma 2.7, we finally arrive at

$$\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\tag{2.60}$$

Before we estimate the third term on the right-hand side of (2.43), we first rewrite:

$$\bar\partial^4 v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet=\bar\partial^4(w\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet)-\sum_{l=0}^{3}a_l\bar\partial^l v\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet=J^{-1}\bar\partial^4h_t-\sum_{l=0}^{3}a_l\bar\partial^l v\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet.$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma q_{,1}\bar\partial^4\Psi^r_\kappa\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^1_r\bar\partial^4 v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|&\le\kappa^2\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet+\beta)_{,1}\bar\partial^4\Psi^r_\kappa\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^1_rJ_\kappa^{-1}\bar\partial^4h_t\Big|\\&+\kappa^2\sum_{l=0}^{3}a_l\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!a^2_\bullet+\beta)_{,1}\bar\partial^4\Psi^r_\kappa\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^1_r\bar\partial^l v\bar\partial^{4-l}\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|.\end{aligned}\tag{2.61}$$

The first term on the right-hand side above is easily bounded as follows:

$$\kappa^2\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma (v\cdot {}^\kappa a^2_\bullet+\beta)_{,1}\,\bar\partial^4\Psi^r_\kappa\,{}^\kappa\!A^1_r J_\kappa^{-1}\bar\partial^4 h_t\Big| \le \sqrt{t}\kappa|(v\cdot {}^\kappa a^2_\bullet+\beta)_{,1}\,{}^\kappa\!A^1_r J_\kappa^{-1}|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}|\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\kappa|\bar\partial^4 h_t|_{L^2_t L^2_x}$$
$$\lesssim \sqrt{t}\kappa P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (2.61) is a sum, and the hardest summand to bound is created when $l=0$. In this case, roughly speaking we bound $|\bar\partial^4\,{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet|_0$ by $\kappa^{-1}|\Lambda_\kappa\Psi|_4$ trading one tangential derivative on $\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Lambda_\kappa D\Psi$ for a bound on $\Lambda_\kappa D\Psi$ in H^3, at the expense of a factor of κ^{-1}. Using this observation we obtain

$$\kappa^2\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma (v\cdot {}^\kappa a^2_\bullet+\beta)_{,1}\,\bar\partial^4\Psi^r_\kappa\,{}^\kappa\!A^1_r v\bar\partial^4\,{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\Big| \lesssim \kappa^2\sqrt{t}|(v\cdot {}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet+\beta)_{,1}\,{}^\kappa\!A^1_r|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}|\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim\sqrt{t}\kappa P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

The next-to-last term on the right-hand side of (2.43) is again a sum and the hardest term to estimate is created again when $l=0$. We use the same idea as in the previous estimate to obtain

$$\Big|\kappa^2\int_0^t\int_\Gamma \bar\partial^4 h_t v\cdot\bar\partial^4\,{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\Big|\lesssim\sqrt{t}\kappa|\bar\partial^4 h_t|_{L^2_t L^2_x}|v|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}\kappa\kappa^{-1}|\Lambda_\kappa\Psi|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

Note that we exploited the presence of the κ-dependent energy term in our energy $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$, using the bound $\kappa|\bar\partial^4 h_t|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\le\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_\kappa}$. In analogous manner, we conclude

$$\Big|\int_\Omega \mathcal{R}_3+\mathcal{R}_5\,dx\Big|+\Big|\int_\Gamma\mathcal{R}_4+\mathcal{R}_6\,dx'\Big|\lesssim(t+\sqrt{t})P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa),$$

where we note that the commutator term, i.e. the first term on the right-hand side of (2.47) deserves special attention. Due to the absence of spatial derivatives acting on $\partial_{tt}\Psi_t$ in

$$-\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_{tt}\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q_{,2})\big(\Psi_{ttt}\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big]-(-q_{,2})\big(\partial_{tt}\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\Big]$$

we can not apply the commutator bound from Lemma 2.6 in the form stated. Here we crucially exploit the κ-dependent term in the energy $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_{tt}\Big[\Lambda_\kappa\big[(-q_{,2})\big(\Psi_{ttt}\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big]-(-q_{,2})\big(\partial_{tt}\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_t\cdot{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\big){}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet\Big]\Big|\\&\le\sqrt{t}|\Lambda_\kappa\Psi_{tt}|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}||q_{,2}\,{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet:{}^\kappa\!A^2_\bullet|_{L^\infty_t W^{1,\infty}_x}\kappa|\Psi_{ttt}|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\\&\le\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa),\end{aligned}\tag{2.62}$$

where we gain one power of κ in the second line above from the commutator estimate and then absorb it into the energy contribution $\kappa|\Psi_{ttt}|_{L^2_t L^2_x}$. The last term on the right-hand side of (2.43) contains the β-contribution from the regularized Dirichlet condition (2.24c). It is easily estimated using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality by a term of the form $Ctm_0+Ct\kappa^2|\bar\partial^4 h_t|^2_{L^2L^2}$ which in turn is smaller than a constant multiple of $tm_0+t\mathcal{E}_\kappa$. Here m_0 is a constant, which depends only on the initial data.

2.6.1. *Estimates for $\int_\Omega\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\int_\Gamma\mathcal{S}_2$.*

In the first term on the right-hand side of (2.52), the harder terms to estimate correspond to the cases $(\bar l,\bar k)=(2,1)$ and $(l,k)=(2,1)$. If $(\bar l,\bar k)=(2,1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega\bar\partial A^k_i\bar\partial^2\partial_t q_{,k}\bar\partial^3 v^i\Big|\le\int_0^t\int_\Omega|\bar\partial(\bar\partial A^k_i\bar\partial^3 v^i)\bar\partial\partial_t q_{,k}|\\&\le\int_0^t\|\bar\partial^2A^k_i\|_\infty\|\bar\partial^3v^i\|_0\|\bar\partial\partial_t q_{,k}\|_0+\int_0^t\|\bar\partial\partial_t A^k_i\|_\infty\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_0\|\bar\partial\partial_t q_{,k}\|_0\\&\lesssim\sqrt{t}\|\bar\partial^2A^k_i\|_{L^\infty_t H^{1.5}_x}\|\bar\partial^3 v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\|q_t\|_{L^2_t H^2_x}+\|\int_0^t\bar\partial A^k_i(s)\,ds\|_{H^{1.5}}\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\|q_t\|_{L^2_t H^2_x}\\&\lesssim\sqrt{t}\|D^2\Psi\|_{L^\infty_t H^{2.5}_x}\|\bar\partial^3 v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\|q_t\|_{L^2_t H^2_x}+t\|Dw\|_{L^2_t H^1_x}\|\bar\partial^4 v^i\|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\|q_t\|_{L^2_t H^2_x}\\&\lesssim(t+\sqrt{t})P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Assume now $(l,k)=(2,1)$, then

$$\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega\bar\partial^2\partial_t A^k_i\bar\partial q_{,k}\bar\partial^3 v^i\Big|\lesssim\sqrt{t}\|q\|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}\|\bar\partial^3 v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\|w\|_{L^2_t H^3_x}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

The second error term is rather straightforward: for any $l=2,3$

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial^{3-l}w\cdot\bar\partial^l v\big(\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3 w\cdot v\big)\Big|\le \|\bar\partial^{3-l}w\|_{L^\infty_t H^{1.5}_x}\int_0^t\|\bar\partial^l v\|_0\|\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3 w\cdot v\|_0\\&\lesssim\sqrt{t}\|w\|_{L^\infty_t H^{2.5}_x}\|\bar\partial^l v\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\|\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3 w\cdot v\|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

If $l=1$, then

$$\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial^2 w\cdot\bar\partial v\big(\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3 w\cdot v\big)\Big|\lesssim\|Dv\|_{L^\infty_t H^{1.5}_x}\|w\|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}\|\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3 w\cdot v\|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

Similar analysis yields:

$$\sum_{l=1}^3\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Omega \bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^s_i\,\bar\partial^{3-l}v^i,_s\big(\bar\partial^3 q_t+\bar\partial^3 w\cdot v\big)\Big|\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

As for the error term (2.53), we start by applying Lemma 2.6 to deal with the commutator term. For any $i,j\in\{1,2\}$ set $F=q,_2\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_i\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_j$, $G=\bar\partial^2 w$ and apply Lemma 2.6 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t\Big|\Lambda_\kappa[(-q,_2)(\bar\partial^3 w\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet]-(-q,_2)(\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet]\Big|^2\lesssim\int_0^t|q,_2\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet:{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet|^2_{W^{1,\infty}}|w|^2_2\\&\lesssim t\sup_{0\le s\le t}|q,_2\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet:{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet|^2_2\sup_{0\le s\le t}|w|^2_2\lesssim tP(\mathcal{E}_\kappa),\end{aligned}\tag{2.63}$$

where, in order to bound $|w|_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}$, we use the equation (2.24d) analogously to the bound (2.56). Upon using Cauchy-Schwarz we get

$$\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^3 w\cdot\big[\Lambda_\kappa[(-q,_2)(\bar\partial^3 w\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet]-(-q,_2)(\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet){}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\big]\Big|\le\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

As for the second term on r.h.s of (2.53) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(-q,_2)(\bar\partial^{3-l}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^l\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet)\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}w\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|\le\int_0^t|q,_2|_\infty\big((|v|_2+|w|_2)|\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet|_0\big)|\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w|_0\\&\lesssim\|q\|_{L^\infty_t H^{2.5}_x}(\|v\|_{L^\infty_t H^{2.5}_x}+|w|_2)|\bar\partial\Psi-Id|_3\int_0^t|\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa w|_0,\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}).\end{aligned}$$

where, the term $|w|^2_{L^\infty_t H^2_x}$ is bounded by $P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa)$ for the same reason as in (2.63). The last term on the right-hand side of (2.53) is a sum, and the hardest term to bound is created when $l=0$. We must integrate by parts with respect to the time variable, to obtain

$$\kappa^2\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3\partial_t h_t v\cdot\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet=\kappa^2\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3 h_t v\cdot\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|_0^t-\kappa^2\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3 h_t v_t\cdot\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet-\kappa^2\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3 h_t v\cdot\bar\partial^3\partial_t\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet.\tag{2.64}$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa^2\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3 h_t v\cdot\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|_0^t&\lesssim\kappa^2 m_0+\kappa|\bar\partial^3 h_t|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}|v|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}\kappa|\int_0^t\partial_t\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x}\\&\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_\kappa}\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_\kappa}\sqrt{t}\kappa|\bar\partial^4 h_t|_{L^2_t L^2_x}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa),\end{aligned}$$

where m_0 depends only on the initial conditions. As for the remaining three terms on the right-hand side of (2.64), they are straightforward to bound using the standard energy estimates. We arrive at

$$\kappa^2\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^3\partial_t h_t v\cdot\bar\partial^3\,{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|\le\kappa^2 m_0+\sqrt{t}(1+\kappa)P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

In analogous manner we conclude

$$\Big|\int_\Omega\mathcal{S}_3\,dx\Big|+\Big|\int_\Gamma\mathcal{S}_4\,dx'\Big|\lesssim(t+\sqrt{t})P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa).$$

2.7. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** The polynomial bound from Proposition 2.5 replaces the typically used Gronwall inequality. Using our κ-independent estimates together with a continuation argument which is detailed in Section 9 of [17], there exists a κ-independent time T such that

$$\mathcal{E}_\kappa(t) \le C\mathcal{E}_\kappa(0) \le C\mathcal{E}(0)+1$$

for κ small enough. Since $\mathcal{E} \le \mathcal{E}_\kappa$ (recall the definitions (1.10) of $\mathcal{E}$ and (2.26) of $\mathcal{E}_\kappa$), we obtain the uniform bound

$$\mathcal{E}(q^\kappa,h^\kappa) \le C\mathcal{E}(0)+1,$$

where $(q^\kappa,h^\kappa)_\kappa$ is a family of solutions to the κ-regularized problem (2.24), $0\le\kappa\le 1$. Thus, passing to the weak limit as $\kappa\to 0$ we obtain a solution on the time interval $[0,T]$ which belongs to the space $\mathcal{S}(T)$ (1.14). Since $\mathcal{S}$ imbeds compactly into $C^{1,2}$ the solution is also classical. Note that the assumptions (2.27) remain valid (on a possibly smaller) time interval $[0,T]$, as both $|\bar\partial h|_{L^\infty_t L^\infty_x}$ and δ are easily controlled by the energy $\mathcal{E}$.

Uniqueness. We only present a brief sketch of the uniqueness argument. A simple application of the energy method also implies uniqueness of the solution. Assume that $(\tilde q,\tilde h)$ also solves (2.24) with the corresponding $\tilde\Psi,\tilde v,\tilde w$. Then the pair $(r,\rho):=(q-\tilde q,h-\tilde h)$ satisfies the following system of equations:

$$r_t - A^j_i\left(A^k_i r,_k\right),_j = (\Delta_\Psi-\Delta_{\tilde\Psi})q-(v-\tilde v)\cdot w+\tilde v(w-\tilde w) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega; \tag{2.65a}$$

$$(v-\tilde v)^i + A^k_i r,_k + \tilde q,_k(A^k_i-\tilde A^k_i) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega; \tag{2.65b}$$

$$r=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma; \tag{2.65c}$$

$$\rho_t = -r,_2 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma; \tag{2.65d}$$

$$\partial_n r = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega_{\text{top}}. \tag{2.65e}$$

Furthermore, initially $(r(0,x),\rho(0,x'))=(0,0)$. Applying $\bar\partial$ to the identity (2.65b), multiplying by $(\bar\partial(v-\tilde v))^i$ and integrating over Ω, we derive the first identity in analogy to the proof of Lemma 2.2. Similarly, applying ∂_t to (2.65b), multiplying by $(v-\tilde v)^i$ and integrating, we obtain the second energy identity. The natural quadratic form that emerges is equivalent to

$$E := \|\bar\partial(v-\tilde v)\|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x} + \|v-\tilde v\|^2_{L^\infty L^2} + \|r\|^2_{L^\infty H^1_x} + \|r_t\|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x} + |\rho|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + |\rho_t|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x}.$$

Furthermore, we have an a-priori control of the high-order derivatives of the two solutions, i.e. for some $M>0$: $\mathcal{E}(q,h)+\mathcal{E}(\tilde q,\tilde h)<M$. From here, we can easily prove the polynomial bound

$$E(t) \le tP(E(t)),$$

which in particular, uses the fact that the initial values for ρ and r are 0. We infer that $E=0$ and hence the uniqueness follows. □

3. The vanishing surface tension limit

The problem of local-in-time existence for the Stefan problem with surface tension becomes considerably simpler in comparison to the classical Stefan problem. One important feature of our method is that it extends directly to the case with the positive surface tension. Even though there is a variety of ways to regularize the problem in the presence of surface tension, for the sake of brevity, we shall formulate the κ-regularized problem exactly as (2.24) apart for the condition (2.24c), which is replaced by

$$q = -\sigma\Lambda_\kappa \frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3} - \kappa^2 v\cdot {}^{\kappa}\!A^2_{\bullet} + \beta \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma, \tag{3.66}$$

with β defined by (2.25). The problem (2.24) with (3.66) in lieu of (2.24c) is the *κ-regularization of the Stefan problem with surface tension.*

With $\sigma>0$, we can prove the following energy identities in the same way as Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3.

Lemma 3.1. *The following identity holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^\sigma_\kappa(q,\Psi)(t) = &\int_0^t\int_\Omega\{\mathcal{R}_1+\mathcal{R}_3+\mathcal{R}_5+\mathcal{S}_1+\mathcal{S}_3\}+\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\{\mathcal{R}_2+\mathcal{R}_4+\mathcal{R}_6+\mathcal{S}_2+\mathcal{S}_4\}\\ &+\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\{\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2+\mathcal{R}^\sigma_4+\mathcal{R}^\sigma_6+\mathcal{S}^\sigma_2+\mathcal{S}^\sigma_4\},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}^\sigma_\kappa = \mathcal{F}_\kappa+\frac{\sigma}{2}\sum_{a+2b\le 4}||\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3/2}J_\kappa^{-1/2}\bar\partial^{a+1}\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h|^2_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}+\sigma\sum_{a+2b\le 3}||\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3/2}J_\kappa^{-1/2}\bar\partial^{a+1}\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h_t|^2_{L^2_tL^2_x},$$

and $\mathcal{R}_i$, $i=1,\dots,6$, $\mathcal{S}_i$, $i=1,\dots,4$ *are given just like in Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. Furthermore,*

(3.67)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}^\sigma_2 := &\big(-\sigma\Lambda_\kappa\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big),_1\bar\partial^4\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^1_\bullet\bar\partial^4 v\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet+\sigma\big\{-\bar\partial^5\Lambda_\kappa h\cdot\bar\partial\big(-\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa h_t|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)+\bar\partial^5\Lambda_\kappa h\Lambda_\kappa h_t|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big\}\\ &+\frac{\sigma}{2}|\bar\partial^5\Lambda_\kappa h|^2\partial_t(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}J_\kappa^{-1})+\sigma\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big[\bar\partial^4(\Lambda_\kappa\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3})-\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big]\\ &+\sigma\sum_{l=1}^4 a_l\bar\partial^{4-l}(w-v)\cdot\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\big(\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}^\sigma_4 := &\big(-\sigma\Lambda_\kappa\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big),_1\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Psi_\kappa\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^1_\bullet\bar\partial^2\partial_t v\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\\ &+\frac{\sigma}{2}|\bar\partial^3\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa h|^2\partial_t(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}J_\kappa^{-1})+\sigma\bar\partial^3\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\big[\bar\partial\partial_t(\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3})-\frac{\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa h_t}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big]\\ &+\sigma\sum_{l+l'\ge 1}a_{l,l'}\bar\partial^2\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa\big(\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^2}\big)\bar\partial^l\partial_t^{l'}(w-v)\cdot\bar\partial^{2-l}\partial_t^{1-l'}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet;\end{aligned}\tag{3.68}$$

(3.69)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}^\sigma_6 := &\big(-\sigma\Lambda_\kappa\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big),_1\Psi_{tt}\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^1_\bullet\partial_{tt}v\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet+\frac{\sigma}{2}|\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}|^2(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}J_\kappa^{-1})_t-\sigma\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}\Lambda_\kappa h_{ttt}\bar\partial(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3})\\ &+\sigma\Lambda_\kappa w_{tt}\big(\partial_{tt}(\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3})-\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big)+\sigma\sum_{l=0}^1 a_l\partial_{tt}\Lambda_\kappa\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\partial_t^l(w-v)\cdot\partial_t^{2-l}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet;\end{aligned}$$

(3.70)

$$\mathcal{S}^\sigma_2 := \sigma\sum_{l=1}^3 a_l\bar\partial^{3-l}(w-v)\cdot\bar\partial^l\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial^3\partial_t\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa\big(\frac{\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\big)+\sigma\sum_{\substack{a+b<4\\ a\le 3,\, b\le 1}}\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial^{a+1}\partial_t^b\Lambda_\kappa h\bar\partial^{3-a}\partial_t^{1-b}\big(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1}\big)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}^\sigma_4 := &\,\sigma\sum_{\substack{l+l'<2\\ l,l'\le 1}}a_{l,l'}\bar\partial^{1-l}\partial_t^{1-l'}(w-v)\cdot\bar\partial^l\partial_t^{l'}\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial\partial_{tt}\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa\big(\frac{\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\big)\\ &+\sigma\sum_{\substack{l+l'<3\\ l\le 1,\, l'\le 2}}b_{l,l'}\bar\partial\partial_t\Lambda_\kappa w\cdot\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\bar\partial^{l+1}\partial_t^{l'}\Lambda_\kappa h\bar\partial^{1-l}\partial_t^{2-l'}\big(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1}\big).\end{aligned}\tag{3.71}$$

3.1. **Estimates.** In the following proposition we prove the basic energy estimate in complete analogy to Proposition 2.5. In particular, it yields the well-posedness statement under the Taylor sign assumption (1.13) as required in Theorem 1.2. Most importantly, it gives us bounds uniform in σ that finally allow passage to the limit $\sigma\to 0$, necessary to finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 3.2. *There exists a constant C independent of σ and a universal polynomial P such that for any $t\in[0,T^\sigma]$ the following bound holds*

$$\mathcal{E}^\sigma_\kappa(t)\le C\mathcal{E}^\sigma_\kappa(0)+C(t+\sqrt{t})P(\mathcal{E}^\sigma_\kappa).$$

In particular, there exists a time $T>0$ independent *of σ, a constant $C^*>0$ and the solution (q^σ,Ψ^σ) to the Stefan problem with surface tension defined on $[0,T]$ satisfying the bound*

$$\mathcal{E}^\sigma(q^\sigma,\Psi^\sigma)\le C^*,\quad 0\le\sigma\le 1.$$

Proof. In comparison to the estimates for the classical Stefan problem carried over in Section 2.6 the only new error terms to estimate are the terms $\mathcal{R}_2^\sigma$, $\mathcal{R}_4^\sigma$, $\mathcal{R}_6^\sigma$, $\mathcal{S}_2^\sigma$, $\mathcal{S}_4^\sigma$ given in the statement of Lemma 3.1.

Estimating $\mathcal{R}_2^\sigma$. We start by bounding the first term on the right-hand side of (3.67).

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa\big(\frac{\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\big)\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\Lambda_\kappa\Psi\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^1_\bullet\bar\partial^4 v\cdot{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Big|\lesssim\int_0^t P(|\sqrt{\sigma}\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h|_4)|\sqrt{\sigma}\Lambda_\kappa\Psi|_5|v|_3\\ &\lesssim P(|\sqrt{\sigma}\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h|_{L^\infty H^4})|\sqrt{\sigma}\Lambda_\kappa\Psi|_{L^\infty H^5}\sqrt{t}|v|_{L^2H^3}\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma).\end{aligned}$$

The second and the third term on the right-hand side of (3.67) are estimated analogously and rely on the standard $L^\infty-L^2-L^2$ estimates. As for the fourth term on the right-hand side of (3.67), note that due to (2.23)

$$\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa h_t\big(\bar\partial^4\big(\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big)-\frac{\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big)\big)\Big|\lesssim\int_0^t|\sqrt{\sigma}\bar\partial^3\Lambda_\kappa h_t|_0\sqrt{\sigma}\big|\bar\partial^4\big(\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi|^3}\big)-\frac{\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^3}\big)\big|_1\lesssim\sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma),$$

where the last estimate follows in the standard way: terms with less derivatives are bounded in L^∞-norm and then further via Sobolev imbedding. In the last term on the right-hand side of (3.67), the hardest case to deal with is $l=4$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\bar\partial^4\Lambda_\kappa\big(\frac{\Lambda_\kappa\bar\partial^2 h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|}\big)=\sigma\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Lambda_\kappa\big(\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)\\ &\quad+\sigma\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\sum_{l'=1}^{4}a_{l'}\bar\partial^{6-l'}\Lambda_\kappa h\bar\partial^{l'}(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-2})=:I+II.\end{aligned}$$

The more challenging term to estimate is term I. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&|I|=\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4{}^{\kappa}\!A^2_\bullet\Lambda_\kappa\big(\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)\Big|\leq\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4(\bar\partial h_\kappa,-1)\bar\partial^6 h_\kappa|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3})\Big|\\ &+\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4(\bar\partial h_\kappa,-1)\big(\Lambda_\kappa\big(\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)-\bar\partial^6 h_\kappa|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3})\big)\Big|\\ &=\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}(v^1-w^1)\bar\partial^5 h_\kappa\bar\partial^6 h_\kappa|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\Big|+\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4(\bar\partial h_\kappa,-1)\big(\Lambda_\kappa\big(\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)-\bar\partial^6 h_\kappa|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3})\big)\Big|\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}\bar\partial(|\bar\partial^5 h_\kappa|^2)(v^1-w^1)|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\Big|+\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\text{commutator term}\Big|\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma J_\kappa^{-1}|\bar\partial^5 h_\kappa|^2\bar\partial\big((v^1-w^1)|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)\Big|+\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma\text{commutator term}\Big|\quad\lesssim tP(\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{commutator term}:=J_\kappa^{-1}(v-w)\cdot\bar\partial^4(\bar\partial h_\kappa,-1)\big(\Lambda_\kappa\big(\bar\partial^6\Lambda_\kappa h|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)-\bar\partial^6 h_\kappa|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3})\big).$$

In the above we used the parametric representation of Ψ in terms of h and integrated by parts. The last inequality is rather standard and follows by estimating $\bar\partial\big((v^1-w^1)|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}\big)$ in L^∞ norm and further via Sobolev inequality, whereas we also know $\sigma|\bar\partial^5 h_\kappa|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\lesssim\mathcal{E}^\sigma$. To bound the commutator term appearing above, we apply the commutator estimate of Lemma 2.6. Term II is easily estimated via the standard energy $L^\infty-L^2-L^2$ bound as well as the remaining cases $l=1,2,3$ in estimating the fourth term on the right-hand side of (3.67): first integrate by parts so to remove one $\bar\partial$-derivative from $\bar\partial^6\Psi$ term and then apply the standard energy estimates.

Estimating $\mathcal{R}_4^\sigma$. The estimates are completely analogous to the ones for $\mathcal{R}_2^\sigma$.

Estimating $\mathcal{R}_6^\sigma$. The first term on the right-hand side of (3.69) is estimated analogously to the first term on the right-hand side of (3.67). Note that

$$\Big|\frac{\sigma}{2}\int_0^t\int_\Gamma|\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}|^2(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}J_\kappa^{-1})_t\Big|\lesssim(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-3}J_\kappa^{-1})_t|_\infty\sigma\int_0^t|\bar\partial\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}|_2^2\lesssim t|\bar\partial h_\kappa|_\infty|\bar\partial h_{\kappa t}|_\infty\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma\lesssim tP(\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma),$$

where we use Sobolev inequality and the definition of $\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma$ to infer

$$|\bar\partial h_{\kappa t}|_\infty^2\lesssim|\bar\partial h_{\kappa t}|_1^2\lesssim\int_\Gamma(-q_{,2})|\bar\partial^2 h_{\kappa t}|^2\lesssim\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\sigma.$$

and similarly

$$|\bar\partial h_\kappa|_\infty^2 \lesssim \int_\Gamma (-q_{,2})|\bar\partial^2 h_\kappa|^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^\sigma_\kappa. \tag{3.72}$$

Space-time integrals of the third and fourth term on the right-hand side of (3.69) are bounded in the usual way by $P(\mathcal{E}^\sigma_\kappa)$. To bound the last term on the right-hand side of (3.69) we distinguish the cases $l=0$ and $l=1$. If $l=1$, by Leibniz rule expand

$$\partial_{tt}\frac{\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h}{|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|} = \bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1} + 2\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h_t(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})_t + \bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})_{tt}.$$

For the first two terms above integrate by parts to move one $\bar\partial$ derivative away from $\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h_{tt}$ and $\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h_t$. Then use the standard $L^\infty - L^2 - L^2$ type estimates as well as the bound $|\bar\partial v_t|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \lesssim \|q_t\|_{L^\infty_t H^{2.5}_x}$ to get the desired estimate. For the third term on right-hand side above we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma\Big|\int_0^t\int_\Gamma \Lambda_\kappa\big(\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})_{tt}\big)\partial_t(w-v)\cdot\partial_t\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet\Big| \\ \le |\bar\partial^2\Lambda_\kappa h|_\infty\sqrt{t}|\sqrt{\sigma}(|\bar\partial\Psi_\kappa|^{-1})_{tt}|_{L^2_tL^2_x}|\partial_t(v-w)|_{L^\infty_tL^2_x}|\partial_t\overset{\kappa}{A}{}^2_\bullet|_{L^\infty_tL^\infty_x} \lesssim \sqrt{t}P(\mathcal{E}^\sigma_\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

Estimating $\mathcal{S}^\sigma_2$ *and* $\mathcal{S}^\sigma_4$. The estimates are straightforward and follow the same principle: terms with least amount of derivatives are bounded via Sobolev embedding by the σ-independent energy $\mathcal{E}(q^\sigma, h^\sigma)$.

Summing up the above estimates we prove the first inequality in the proposition. The existence of (q^σ, Ψ^σ) follows by passing to the limit $\kappa\to 0$ in the same way as in Subsection 2.7. The existence of σ-independent time T follows from the standard continuity argument and the fact that constant C in the proved inequality in the proposition is σ-independent. Since $\mathcal{E}^\sigma(0)\to\mathcal{E}(0)$ as $\sigma\to 0$, the last statement of the proposition follows suit. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Assume that $\|(q^\sigma,\Psi^\sigma)-(q^0,\Psi^0)\|_{C^{1,2}}$ does *not* converge to 0 as $\sigma\to 0$. Then there exists an $\epsilon>0$ and a subsequence $(\sigma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\sigma_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, such that

$$\|(q^{\sigma_n},\Psi^{\sigma_n})-(q^0,\Psi^0)\|_{C^{1,2}} \ge \epsilon \quad \forall n\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.73}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}(q^{\sigma_n},\Psi^{\sigma_n})\le C$, there exists a subsequence of $(q^{\sigma_n},\Psi^{\sigma_n})_n$ (without loss of generality indexed again by (σ_n)) and $(\bar q,\bar\Psi)\in\mathcal{S}$ such that

$$(q^{\sigma_n},\Psi^{\sigma_n}) \rightharpoonup (\bar q,\bar\Psi), \quad \text{weakly in } \mathcal{S}.$$

Note that the injection operator $I:\mathcal{S}\to C^{1,2}$ is compact. Hence $(q^{\sigma_n},\Psi^{\sigma_n})\to(\bar q,\bar\Psi)$ in $C^{1,2}$ and since $\sigma_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, $(\bar q,\bar\Psi)$ solves the classical Stefan problem with initial conditions $(\bar q(0),\bar\Psi(0))=(q_0,\mathrm{Id})$. From the uniqueness statement of Theorem 1.1, we conclude that $(\bar q,\bar\Psi)=(q^0,\Psi^0)$. Thus $(q^{\sigma_n},\Psi^{\sigma_n})\to(q^0,\Psi^0)$ in $C^{1,2}$ contradicting (3.73). □

4. The three-dimensional case

In this section, we briefly sketch how to adapt the analysis of the previous sections to prove theorems analogous to Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 in the *three* dimensional setting. We assume now that $\Omega(t)\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ is an evolving phase in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and the initial and reference domain are given by

$$\Omega=\mathbb{T}^2\times]0,1[,$$

where $\mathbb{T}^2$ stands for the 2-torus. Initially at $t=0$ the *bottom* boundary

$$\Gamma=\mathbb{T}^2\times\{x^3=0\}$$

is the initial reference boundary of the moving domain $\Gamma(t)$, whereas the *top* boundary $\partial\Omega_{\mathrm{top}}=\mathbb{T}^2\times\{x^3=1\}$ is fixed and the temperature p satisfies the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$ just like in (1.2). We parametrize boundary as a graph over Γ with the height function $h(t,x')$, where $x' := (x^1, x^2)$. Via the same ALE change of variables as in (1.6), we obtain the fixed boundary problem given by (1.9). The associated energy is given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{3D}(t) = \mathcal{E}^{3D}(q,h)(t) := & \sum_{|\alpha|+2b\le 5} \|\bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b v\|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|\alpha|+2b\le 4} \|\bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b v\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|\alpha|+2b\le 5} |\sqrt{-q_{,2}}\bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b h|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \sum_{|\alpha|+2b\le 4} |\sqrt{-q_{,2}}\bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b h_t|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|\alpha|+2b\le 5} \|\bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b q + \bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b \Psi \cdot v\|^2_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \sum_{|\alpha|+2b\le 4;} \|\bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b q_t + \bar\nabla^\alpha \partial_t^b \Psi_t \cdot v\|^2_{L^2_t L^2_x}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.74}
$$

In the above definition, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is a multi-index of order $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, whereby α_1, α_2 are non-negative integers. Symbol $\bar\nabla$ refers to differentiation in tangential directions, i.e. $\bar\nabla^\alpha := \partial_{x^1}^{\alpha_1}\partial_{x^2}^{\alpha_2}$. The three-dimensional Taylor sign condition for a function q reads:

$$
\lambda^{3D}(t) := \inf_{x' \in \Gamma} (-q_{,3})(t, x', 0) > 0. \tag{4.75}
$$

The following theorem holds:

Theorem 4.1. *Let the initial conditions* (q_0, h_0) *be such that* $\mathcal{E}^{3D}(q_0, h_0) < \infty$ *and let* q_0 *satisfy the Taylor sign condition (4.75). Then the three-dimensional one-phase classical Stefan problem is locally-in-time well-posed, i.e. there is a* $T > 0$ *such that there exists a unique solution* (q, h) *with the initial data* (q_0, h_0) *on the time interval* $[0, T]$*. In addition it satisfies the bound:*

$$
\mathcal{E}^{3D}(q,h) \le 2\mathcal{E}^{3D}(q_0, h_0).
$$

Furthermore, let $(q_0^\sigma, \Psi_0^\sigma)_{\sigma \ge 0}$ *be a given family of well-prepared initial conditions in the sense of Definition 1. Assume that it satisfies the Taylor sign condition (4.75) and the corresponding compatibility conditions. By* $(q^\sigma, h^\sigma)_{\sigma \ge 0}$ *we denote the associated family of solutions to the problem (1.9). There exists a* σ*-independent time* $T > 0$ *and a constant* C *depending only on* (q_0, h_0) *such that*

$$
\mathcal{E}^{3D,\sigma}(q^\sigma, h^\sigma)(T) \le C \quad \sigma \ge 0.
$$

for all $\sigma \ge 0$*. As a consequence, sequence* (q^σ, h^σ) *converges to the unique solution* (q, h) *of the classical Stefan problem (1.9) with* $\sigma = 0$ *in* $C^{1,2}$ *norm.*

Remark 13. *Note that the definition of* $\mathcal{E}^{3D}$ *contains time derivatives. Thus, to make sense out of the assumption* $\mathcal{E}^{3D}(q_0, h_0) < \infty$*, we express the time derivatives* $\partial_t q_0$ *and* $\partial_t h_0$ *in terms of the spatial derivatives as explained in Remark 3.*

Acknowledgements. MH was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant CMG-0530862 and the European Research Council under grant ERC-240385. SS was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-1001850, and by the United States Department of Energy through the Idaho National Laboratorys LDRD Project NE-156.

References

[1] Almgren, F, Wang, L.: Mathematical existence of crystal growth with Gibbs-Thomson curvature effects. *J. Geom. Anal.* **10** no.1, 1-100 (2000)

[2] Ambrose D.M., Masmoudi, N.: The zero surface tension limit of three-dimensional water waves. *Indiana U. Math. J.* **58** 479-522 (2009)

[3] Ambrose D.M., Masmoudi, N.: The zero surface tension limit of two-dimensional water waves. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math* **58** 1287-1315 (2005)

[4] Athanasopoulos, I., Caffarelli, L. A., Salsa, S.: Regularity of the free boundary in parabolic phase-transition problems. *Acta Math.* **176**, 245-282 (1996)

[5] Athanasopoulos, I., Caffarelli, L. A., Salsa, S.: Phase transition problems of parabolic type: flat free boundaries are smooth. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **51**, 77-112 (1998)

[6] Caffarelli, L.A.: Some aspects of the one-phase Stefan problem. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **27** 73–77 (1978)

[7] Caffarelli, L.A., Evans, L.C. Continuity of the temperature in the two-phase Stefan problem. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **81**, 199–220 (1983)

[8] L.A. Caffarelli, S. Salsa: A Geometric Approach to Free Boundary Problems. *American Mathematical Society*, Providence, RI, 2005.

[9] Castro, A., Córdoba, D., Gancedo, F.: Some recent results on the Muskat problem. *Journees Equations aux Derivees Partielles.* (2010)

[10] Chen, X.: The Hele-Shaw problem and area-preserving curve-shortening motions. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **123**, no.2, 117-151 (1993)

[11] Chen, X., Hong, J., Yi, F.: Existence, uniqueness, and regularity of classical solutions of the Mullins-Sekerka problem. *Comm. Part. Diff. Equ.* **21**, 1705-1727 (1996)

[12] Chen, X., Reitich, F.: Local existence and uniqueness of solutions of the Stefan problem with surface tension and kinetic undercooling. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **164**, 350-362 (1992)

[13] Constantin, P., Pugh, M.: Global solutions for small data to the Hele-Shaw problem. *Nonlinearity* **6**, 393-415 (1993)

[14] Constantin, P., Córdoba, D., Gancedo, F., Strain, R. M.: On the global existence for the Muskat problem. *To appear in Jour. European Math. Soc*

[15] Córdoba, A., Córdoba, D., Gancedo, F.: Interface evolution: the Hele-Shaw and Muskat problems. *Annals of Math.* **173**, no. 1, 477–542 (2011)

[16] Córdoba, A., Córdoba, D., Gancedo, F.: Porous media: the Muskat problem in 3D. *Submitted*

[17] Coutand, D., Shkoller, S.: On the interaction between quasilinear elastodynamics and the Navier-Stokes equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **179**, No. 3, 303–352 (2006)

[18] Coutand, D., Shkoller, S.: Well-posedness of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations with or without surface tension. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20**, No. 3, 829-930 (2007)

[19] Coutand, D., Shkoller, S.: A simple proof of well-posedness for the free surface incompressible Euler equations. *Discr. Cont. Dyn. Systems, Series S* **3**, No. 3, 429-449 (2010)

[20] Dacorogna, B., Moser, J.: On a partial differential equation involving the Jacobian determinant. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **7** no.1, 1-26 (1990)

[21] De Giorgi, E.: Γ-convergenza e G-convergenza. *Boll. Un.Mat.Ital.* **5-B** 213220, (1977)

[22] Escher, J., Prüss, J., Simonett, G.: Analytic solutions for a Stefan problem with Gibbs-Thomson correction. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **563**, 1-52 (2003)

[23] Escher, J, Simonett, G.: A center manifold analysis for the Mullins-Sekerka model. *J. Differential Eqns.* **143** no.2, 267-292 (1998)

[24] A. Friedman: *Variational Principles and Free Boundary Problems.* Wiley, New York (1982)

[25] Friedman, A.: The Stefan problem for a hyperbolic heat equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **138**, 249–279 (1989)

[26] Friedman, A., Kinderlehrer, D.: A one phase Stefan problem. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **25** 1005–1035 (1975)

[27] Friedman, A., Reitich, F.: The Stefan problem with small surface tension. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **328**, 465-515 (1991)

[28] Friedman, A., Reitich, F.: Nonlinear stability of a quasi-static Stefan problem with surface tension: a continuation approach. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa - Cl. Scienze Sér. 4.* **30** no. 2, 341-403 (2001)

[29] Frolova, E. V., Solonnikov, V.A.: L_p-theory for the Stefan problem. *J. Math. Sci.* **99**, no. 1, 989-1006 (2000)

[30] B. Gustafsson, A. Vasil'ev: *Conformal and Potential Analysis in Hele-Shaw Cells.* Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel-Boston-Berlin (2006)

[31] Hadžić, M.: Orthogonality conditions and asymptotic stability in the Stefan problem with surface tension. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* To appear

[32] Hadžić, M., Guo, Y.: Stability in the Stefan problem with surface tension (I). *Commun. Partial Differential Eqns.* **35** (2), 201-244 (2010)

[33] Hanzawa, E.I.: Classical solution of the Stefan problem. *Tohoku Math, J.* **33**, 297-335 (1981)

[34] O.A. Ladyženskaja, V.A. Solonnikov, N.N. Uralceva: Linear and Quasilinear equations of Parabolic Type. *Trans. Math. Monographs* **23**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1968), Russian edition: Nauka, Moscow (1967).

[35] Luckhaus, S.: Solutions for the two-phase Stefan problem with the Gibbs-Thomson law for the melting temperature. *Europ. J. Appl. Math.* **1**, 101-111 (1990)

[36] Meirmanov, A. M.: *The Stefan Problem.* De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 3, 1992

[37] Prüss, J., Saal, J., Simonett, G.: Existence of analytic solutions for the classical Stefan problem. *Math. Ann.* **338**, 703-755 (2007)

[38] Radkevich, E.V.: Gibbs-Thomson law and existence of the classical solution of the modified Stefan problem. *Soviet Dokl. Acad. Sci.* **316**, 1311-1315 (1991)

[39] Lord Rayleigh. On the instability of jets. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **1** s1-10, 4-13. (1878)

[40] Röger, M.: Solutions for the Stefan problem with Gibbs-Thomson law by a local minimisation. *Interfaces Free Bound.* **6**, 105-133 (2004)

[41] Siegel, M., Tanveer, S., Dai, W. S.: Singular effects of surface tension in evolving Hele-Shaw flows. *J. Fluid mech.* **323**, 201–236 (1996)

[42] Soner, M.: Convergence of the phase-field equations to the Mullins-Sekerka problem with a kinetic undercooling. *Arc. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **131**, 139-197 (1995)

[43] Tanveer, S.: Evolution of Hele-Shaw interface for small surface tension. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., A* **343**, no. 1668, 155–204 (1993)

[44] Taylor, G.: The Instability of Liquid Surfaces when Accelerated in a Direction Perpendicular to their Planes. I *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **201** no. 1065, 192–196 (1950)

[45] Tian, F. R.: Hele-Shaw problems in multidimensional spaces. *J. Nonlinear Science* **10**, 275–290 (2000)

[46] A. Visintin: *Models of Phase Transitions.* Progr. Nonlin. Diff. Equ. Appl. **28**. Boston: Birkhauser 1996

[47] A. Visintin: *Introduction to Stefan-Type Problems.* Handbook of Differential Equations, Evolutionary equations, **4**, 377-484, Elsevier B.V., North-Holland (2008)

[48] Wu, S.: Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 2-D. *Invent. Math.* **130**, no. 1, 39–72 (1997)

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616